EVOLUTION *and* RELIGION

JOHN L. ROBINSON, PH.D.

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

RF22
R56

W. James Robinson
Fort Smith, Ark

EVOLUTION
and RELIGION

EVOLUTION *and* RELIGION

By

JOHN L. ROBINSON, PH. D.

1923

THE STRATFORD CO., PUBLISHERS

Boston, Massachusetts

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

Copyright, 1923
The STRATFORD CO., Publishers
Boston, Mass.

The Alpine Press, Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

213.5
R662

Dedicated

TO MY WIFE AND OUR DAUGHTER, OLIVE, AND
TO ALL OTHER LOVERS OF TRUTH
AND RIGHT-LIVING.

N15044

Foreword

TO GIVE to every man, woman, and child of our Nation, the opportunity to prepare themselves for successful living is a prodigious task. However, that is exactly what the educational and religious forces of the United States are attempting to do. Millions of dollars are spent every year for research work in order that new devices may be perfected and put into use for the comfort of human beings and that facts, hitherto unknown to man, may be discovered to add to the happiness of mankind by helping them to understand the beauties and wonders of nature about them. Other millions are used for securing the services of some of the best, both morally and intellectually, of our citizens as teachers and ministers for guiding our young people in their search for knowledge and happiness. Based on such principles it is no wonder that the United States has attained such preeminence in such a short period of time.

In order to continue our advancement it is necessary to embody in our teaching all newly discovered facts. However, there are a few people who wish to have laws which would prohibit the teaching of certain facts which they say are not in harmony with the Bible, although some of them admit they

know nothing about the new facts of science and *should* admit that they know very little about the Bible. It is the greatest puzzle of modern times to try to understand how a sane man who has no knowledge of biology and who has done no studying in a theological institution can continue to say that the best scientists are wrong in the interpretation of biological facts and that the most highly trained ministers are wrong in the interpretations of the Bible.

I take pleasure in writing the foreword for this work, written by one who has attained distinction as a minister and has taken the time to properly inform himself on the subject of evolution which he shows conclusively is in complete harmony with Christianity.

This book should do a great deal towards driving from the face of the earth superstition, prejudice and ignorance regarding the general theory of evolution and the Bible. It should silence those who are ignorant of natural sciences and who have had no special training on the origin and interpretation of the Bible. It can be read with pleasure and profit by all, and should be studied diligently by those who desire to know the truth.

R. C. SPANGLER.
Assistant Professor of Botany,
West Virginia University.
Morgantown, West Virginia.

Contents

Chapter		*Page*
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Who Are Evolutionists?	17
III.	Who Are the Anti-Evolutionists?	39
IV.	Evolution and the Bible	46
V.	The Bible Not an Inerrant Book	67
VI.	Some of the Evidences of Evolution	79
VII.	Evolution and Revelation	125
VIII.	What Should Be Our Attitude Toward Evolution	132
IX.	Outlook for the Future of Evolution and Academic Freedom	146
	Bibliography	169

CHAPTER I

Introduction

THERE is a wide-spread interest in the subject of evolution, and the people of a great, free, and progressive country ought to study the subject in a sincere, intelligent way, in order that we may know the truth.

It is not a question of the soul's everlasting salvation; but the principles of evolution underlie the whole framework of a complete and thorough-going education. The study and discussion should be carried on in the spirit of Ephesians 4:31; "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil-speaking be put away from you, with all malice."

Evolution is a beautiful doctrine. It is wonderfully interesting. It tells us of the far-away beginnings of very simple forms of vegetable and animal life on this planet of ours. It shows us some of the steps in the process and some of the causes of the progress of those

simple forms into higher and still higher life, until we reach the wonderful, the sublime perfection of our present order. As we study the evidence of those long ages of slow growth; as we see a little done here and there to make things strong, useful, and beautiful, we are filled with wonder at the unwearied toil of the over-patient God. Presumably, He could have made the horse in a few minutes as perfect and as beautiful as he is today, but the fact seems most thoroughly established that He worked at it hundreds of thousands of years. That is nothing to God's discredit. He has a right to do things in His own way. Why this length of time instead of a few minutes or hours, no one knows. Maybe some day we shall know.

There are two very interesting facts in connection with this part of the subject: the first is, that very few things in the vegetable and animal world have been brought to their present state of perfection without the help of man. God made the ponies and donkeys of a far-away time, but he said, in effect, to man: "If you want the draught horse or the race horse you must help." So man, by artificial selection, has

helped to make the work horse and the racer. God made the *rosaceae,* the wild rose, the crab apple, but man, by artificial selection, has helped to make the wonderful American Beauty rose, the Winesap apple, the peach, the plum and many other delicious fruits. This is in keeping with the Scriptures which say: "For we are workers together with God." First Corinthians 3:9. God made the trees with wood that is resonant, but God could not make the perfect violin without Stradivarius. Stradivarius was not impertinent when he said that God could not make the perfect violin without him. In thousands of other things, in our industrial, our moral, our spiritual upbuilding we must work together with God.

The other interesting and awful fact is this: the laws of evolution do not always mean upward progress. If a bud grows out on the side of the oak, it can grow sidewise or downwise, but it can never go back into the tree, and become a terminal bud. So it is with the present-day monkey. "It is not on the highway to become a man." (LeConte). It missed its opportunity, if it ever had it, once and for all.

The degeneration of the body and the degeneration of the soul are sad facts in human history.

Man has not reached a state of perfection in his industrial life, nor in any department of his life. Evolution and man have not done their perfect work. Even a very casual glance at the evils in human life shows us its sad disharmonies. Some people living in sinful waste, and others dying for want of bread. Greed, lust of power, brute appetite uncontrolled. The worst of all, some people do not care. The divine community interest in them has not yet been awakened. But, while there is no reason for gloom, there is the most urgent reason for us to bestir ourselves. There is such a thing as the evolution of our industrial system, our morals, our spiritual ideals. The silent God is working on, knocking at the door of our reason, and insistently putting before us the everlasting OUGHT. Out of this is going to come a finer race of men. More peace, more safety, more bread.

The doctrine of evolution is true to some extent, at least. That there is wonderful variation in plant and animal life, even at the present

time, no educated man would think of denying. Since the beginning of human history man has witnessed the variation in the horse, dog, and other animals, and in plants, fruits, etc. The rose, the crab apple, the peach, the plum, the strawberry and other berries all came from a common ancestor. They are all *rosaceae*. What a wonderful thing that such different fruits and flowers should come from a common stem! Is it unreasonable to believe that this law of variation has been going on ever since the appearance of the first plant cell and the first animal cell, some millions of years ago? If variation has been going on millions of years, the most natural, the most reasonable thing to expect is the development of things in the manner affirmed by evolutionists—gradual changes from lower to higher—"descent with modifications." Let us give the evolutionists a patient hearing and patient study when they tell us that there has been progressive change, generation after generation, and that these changes have been in keeping with well-established laws, and by means of forces residing within the organism.

The man who thinks that the evolutionary

theory of the origin of man contradicts the Bible — is he perfectly certain that he understands the Bible language which describes the creation of man? Is he perfectly certain that God made man as a child makes mud dolls? This was the way I thought man was made when I was a child. Some people seem to thing so today.

Are you perfectly certain that God made man with his hands and fingers? This seems to have been the belief of the Psalmist. "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, etc." Psa. 8:3. The Psalmist seems to think that there was another way, with his "voice," with the "word of his mouth." Psalm 33:6, 33:9. Are the anti-evolutionists perfectly certain that man was made with the hands and fingers of God? Or was he made with His "voice," with His "word"?

Some of the Fathers of the church in the beginning of Christianity believed that God made man with his hands and fingers, but some of them did not. Some said "that is a too materialistic way of looking at the subject. Man was made," they said, "by the 'voice of God'."

This last position was held by St. Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Bede, and others. Do the anti-evolutionists know for a certainty which one of these methods was employed?

There is another question that should be considered in connection with the Bible account: May it not be that man began his development then as he does now from a microscopic germ cell? May it not be that God first made the germ cell substantially as we know it today, and caused it to grow through all the stages of development as it does today? He might have done it in a few hours instead of nine months, or ten months or more. Who knows? Is there anything in the Bible text to rule out this last supposition?

The anti-evolutionist has a big task on his hand when he undertakes to tell us *just exactly* how man was made.

As we can not tell for a certainty how man was made according to Bible accounts, it will not be out of place to hear what evolutionists have to say about the method of man's creation.

But, it is insisted, "man was made in the image of God," and that precludes the doctrine

of descent from lower forms of animal life. Is God's bodily form like man's, only a little bigger? Is bodily shape what is meant when it is said "man was made in the image of God?" That was the old idea, but more and more people of all denominations are throwing aside that idea. Jesus said: "God is spirit." Our likeness to God is a spiritual likeness. We have intellect, sensibility, and will, like God. This is the supreme difference between man and the lower forms of life. Because of this difference we affirm of man what we do not affirm of any other creature — we call him a child of God. This is the real worthwhile thing about our likeness to God. If God has a bodily form, and, if it is meant we are like this bodily form there is nothing helpful, inspiring about that; but if our likeness is a spiritual likeness that is something great indeed, and should fill us with reverence and gratitude.

There are many thousands of good people who believe that the Bible teaches man was made in a day or less time, out of dust or mud, and, it is asked, why disturb their faith? That is a pertinent question, and deserves a candid,

sympathetic answer. Evolutionists have no wish to destroy people's preconceived notions unless they think they can give something as good or better to take their place. It is said by the over-cautions, "if ignorance is bliss, it is surely folly to be wise." That is true to a limited extent, and in a very few things. I do not think that the details of coarse, vulgar crimes should be published to the world. Surely no one is made better, but worse, by such filthy details. But knowledge in general is the spirit of the age. Important things are not kept secret as in former days. Our statesmen are advocating open diplomacy. "Open covenants between nations, openly arrived at," is a splendid slogan. Even the sex relation we are discussing in a serious, reverent way for the protection of our boys and girls. So, whatever truth seems to be important, we come out into the open, and discuss it.

A thousand years ago and less most all the good people and some that were not good believed that the earth was flat, and it disturbed somebody's faith greatly, when it was first pointed out that it was round. Then came the

distressing news to many good people that the earth revolves around the sun, and not the sun around the earth, and that the sun, and not the earth, is the center of our planetary system. The fact is, ever since man has been on this globe, and has found out some great truths or traditions by which he has shaped his life, along has come some new thing to modify or upset his beliefs. Perhaps this thing will go on to the end of time. But what shall we say of the new things that have upset or modified the beliefs of man? Unless the origin of man from lower forms by slow graduations is an exception, I can say without fear of serious dissent that no great prophet has taken a stand against the old views, no body of scientists has taken a position against the old doctrines without giving something better in return. I will give three examples. Hundreds could be given. We can see the disturbing, uplifting beginning of the new things in the Old Testament. Some of the scribes or prophets had taught that the children were punished for the sins of their fathers; but another prophet rose up, and said, every man must bear his own iniquity. "What mean ye,

that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord, God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezekiel 18:3-4. This whole eighteenth chapter is a plain setting forth of the fact that God deals with the children according to what *they* have done, not according to what their fathers have done.

No one has studied the Old Testament aright if he does not see that it is an upward progress from lower to higher ideals. And every step of the progress has disturbed someone's faith.

In the fifth chapter of Matthew, Jesus puts a better interpretation upon some of the laws and traditions of the Old Testament. He spoke against the doctrine of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth."

In offering the new for the old he gave something better.

The same is true of scientists. In all the past

they have given something better in place of the old. I will not say, dogmatically, that evolution is as firmly established as the method of creation as gravitation is, as the method of sustentation; but I will say, if the overwhelming majority of scientists and educated people in general accept it as such, it will be because they see in it a wider vision of God and a better understanding of our duties to man. Let us forever get away from the idea that the truth about the Bible or the great laws of nature can hurt any one. One of the greatest things Jesus ever said was: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." *The Churchman* (Episcopal) has in a recent issue a very wise word for all ministers in reference to teaching the truth about the Bible, as reported in *The Literary Digest,* July 1, 1922. It says:

"How many rectors have told their parishioners frankly from the pulpit what kind of book the Bible is, how it was fashioned, what has been the history of the progressive revelation of God?" If pastors had been frank and outspoken in this respect,

"Would there be as much perplexity, as many

false deductions in the minds of the people who are still trying to build their faith, erect ethical theories and rules of conduct upon isolated texts in the New Testament, when textual criticism may have proved that some of these passages are spurious or do not mean what they seem to say? We are familiar with the one striking objection to frankness in these matters in the pulpit. The fear of disturbing the faith of parishioners has sapped the courage of a good many rectors. They are afraid that the truth will be misunderstood. We must all respect that precious anxiety which every rector feels for the faith of those committed to his care. But sincerity need not be tactless. It can avoid being clever and disdainful. But pastors, we are confident, have leaned over backwards in their fear of hurting somebody's faith. The result of their anxiety has been that they have lost the intellectual respect of the young. Laymen are going outside the churches to learn what the clergy have tried to conceal, and these laymen think that the clergy are ignorant. They think of us as sheltered and innocent and are afraid to shock us even by asking us

questions. They flatter themselves that what they think about the Bible is heretical, when those same opinions were taught a generation ago to their rector in his theological seminary."

"It has proved far less dangerous for the clergy to teach the truth they know than to conceal it for fear of hurting somebody's faith. The faith of the Church is, after all, not so shaky and feeble a thing that it must avoid the light. Nor was the truth ever delivered into our hands as a deposit that must be fearfully hid away. It is amply able to take care of itself, provided we yield to it the loyalty of sincerity. When anxious rectors say that the truth might undermine the faith of their people, they are taking themselves too seriously and the truth not seriously enough. Never, in all the long centuries of its use, has the Bible stood upon firmer ground than it does today. Never has its great central message of salvation for a race misled by false gods and blinded by sin rung clearer and sweeter than it does today. God is not afraid, we are quite sure, lest we be sincere. What He fears is our indirection, and, perhaps, He fears most of all

the zeal of ignorant men, unfitted to teach, who are shouting from the housetops a message undisturbed by facts."

Already thousands of people, ministers and laymen, professors in our universities and high schools, social workers, men and women in all walks of life claim to see in the laws of evolution and in the plain truth of historical criticism of the Bible the greater wisdom and goodness of God, and they feel a deeper sense of responsibility in the keeping of those laws. By man's efforts and the ceaseless workings of the natural laws of God, man has been brought to his present state of advancement. How can he violate these laws and descend below the level of the brute from which he came? *Living* the Ten Commandments and the Beatitudes of Jesus are the requirements of a sane interpretation of evolution. How can we break these great laws, and sin against God? There is not a truth in physiology which helps us to develop a sound mind in a sound body; there is not a truth of better industrial relations which brings us nearer to our brothers in toil; there is not a truth of better community up-building, nor

is there a moral or spiritual truth that does not find a hearty approval and sincere championship by people who believe in evolution. Evolutionists seek to know the truth, though it may be hoary with age, and they dare to believe that there is much truth yet to be known, and they do not fear its effects upon human life.

The wise attitude on the subject is to welcome the new if it bears the marks of sincerity and truth.

Robert Browning gives us a beautiful and most stimulating thought in *Paracelsus:*

> "Progress is
> The law of life, man is not Man as yet.
> Nor shall I deem his object served, his end
> Attained, his genuine strength put fairly forth,
> While only here and there a star dispels
> The darkness, — here and there a towering mind
> O'er looks its prostrate fellows: when the host
> Is out at once to the despair of night,
> When all mankind alike is perfected,
> Equal in full-blown powers—then, not till then,
> I say, begins man's general infancy."

CHAPTER II

Who Are Evolutionists?

I AM not as much interested in proving that evolution is true as I am in showing that evolutionists are not atheists nor infidels; that there is no necessary connection between evolution and atheism.

Two or three men have made themselves very conspicuous in this country in their attempt to cast a shadow upon the religious beliefs and purposes of evolutionists. This is a most extraordinary thing. It is impossible to understand the mental make-up of the man who deals out such unwarrantable criticism against the men and women who teach evolution. Forty years ago when the doctrines of evolution were new, and their bearings on moral and religious subjects not well understood, it was not surprising that many men and women should have manifested a hostile attitude. But forty years ago, evolutionists, after a long and very bitter

fight, won the day. Since then there has not been a scientist of any note who has opposed the main principles of evolution. Nearly all the universities and high schools in Christendom are teaching it. Untold thousands of ministers of all denominations in this country and Europe are declaring their belief in it, and have said over and over again that they see in the doctrine the greater thought of God, a more wondrous universe, the greater sanctions of law, and the ceasless presence and power of the Immanent God. I am well aware of the fact that majorities are not always in the right; but when a majority of our leading ministers espouse a cause, seeing in it plenty of room for God, surely the implications of atheism should not be allowed in the discussion.

Furthermore there are millions of laymen and laywomen, graduates of our colleges, and some who are not graduates who believe the doctrine. They are among the best workers in the churches, interested in all social betterment; their lives are dominated by high moral and spiritual ideals, and they do not forget to pray in deep sincerity for Divine wisdom and

strength to help them live this life aright. If they are your neighbors and friends, and if you are honest and fair in your judgment you are bound to say that these are men and women in whom there is no guile. I believe Jesus knew what he was talking about when He said: "By their fruits ye shall know them. Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles." Judged by this rule it is easy to believe that the lives of these men and women have been touched by the power of God. They do not parade their religious experiences before men. The deepest experiencs of the soul are the ones about which most people are apt to be silent. Some experiences are too sacred to talk about much, yet some of these men and women who believe in evolution have declared and rejoiced in the truth that God has come into their lives, and has helped them to battle successfully against the temptations and hardships of life.

Over and over they are saying:

"Without Thee, nothing is strong, nothing holy."

"In finding Thee are all things round us found;
In losing Thee are all things lost besides."

How inexplicable it is, therefore, that some men will go before legislatures and congregations, and say these men and women are atheists, infidels, the corruptors of our youth!

Thousands of men and women who teach evolution are mothers and fathers. They are as much interested in the moral and religious welfare of their children and their neighbors' children as any one can be. They know the bearings of scientific teaching on the lives of people, and it is unthinkable that they would persistently teach that which is subversive of good morals.

Let us consider the utterances of some of the scientists and ministers who have written on the subject. Let us begin with Darwin. Darwin has been singled out by anti-evolutionists as the chief sinner, the one above all others upon whose head should be poured the peoples' "vials of wrath."

It would be amusing if it were not a serious subject the way some people "hit Darwin." They seem to think that if they could just get Darwin out of the way there would be no evolution or it would be so emasculated that it

could do no harm! All of this proceeds from erroneous conceptions of what Darwinism is and of the attitude of other scientists toward his teaching. There is no evolutionist, past or present, who does not teach with Darwin the origin of species by "descent with modifications." All believe with him that there is an indefinite variation of plant and animal forms; that there is a struggle for existence, and that the fittest survives. Whether Darwin's theory of "natural selection" accounts for the origin of species better than Romanes theory of "physiological selection" is a question upon which scientists are divided; but they are unanimous in their belief in the fundamental principle that all higher forms have come from lower forms by descent with modifications.

Therefore, to try to destroy evolution by showing that there is a difference of opinion among evolutionists as to the factors which give rise to species is as futile as it is to try to prove that there is no such thing as Christianity by pointing out some of the irreconcilable differences between different denominations of Christians. Whatever may be their differences as

to baptism, church government, atonement or what not, they are all agreed that Jesus is their Leader or their Christ, and *that* constitutes Christianity.

If you throw away Darwin's theory of the "Survival of the Fittest" or "Natural Selection" as an insufficient explanation of the origin of species — and quite a number of evolutionists have never believed that theory — the great principles of evolution still remain, the origin of all forms from lower forms, according to well-established natural laws, and by means of forces that reside in the organism. Remember, also, that the doctrine of "Natural Selection" is only one of many factors or causes that give rise to species.

Let us examine some of Darwin's utterances with respect to his beliefs in primary causes — or God behind physical phenomena. In his *Descent of Man* speaking of the slow growth of moral and religious ideas, he says: "The grand idea of God hating sin and loving righteousness was unknown during primeval times." "With the more civilized races, the conviction of the existence of an all-seeing Deity has had

a potent influence on the advance of morality." (*Descent of Man,* page 626, second edition.)

In speaking of evolution Mr. Darwin says: "There is a grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed laws of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved."

Let us be honest with the facts and with these words. Is there anything atheistic in these utterances? Anything that could debauch the morals of people or throw a shadow on their spiritual aspirations?

Some anti-evolutionists say that at the close of Darwin's life he professed not to know anything about the existence of God. I shall discuss this in another chapter. It will be seen that nothing that he said destroys the value of these plain wholesome utterances.

Next we will consider the position of Huxley. Huxley was a staunch supporter of Darwin, and did more than any man in Europe or America

to popularize evolution. He was fiercely attacked by some of his conservative countrymen, mostly ministers, and he replied in plain and vigorous terms. He was called atheist, agnostic, infidel. Without any doubt he was not as outspoken in his belief of God as was LeConte, Fisk, Drummond, and others. But his agnosticism was more of the type of Job's, who asked, chapter 11:7: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?"

Would you stigmatize Job as an atheist? Huxley and a great many others have the modesty of Job and Paul. They do not pretend to know God unto perfection. Their attitude toward some of the great questions of life is in keeping with I Corinthians, 13:12: "Now we see through a glass darkly; now we know in part."

Huxley was agnostic, however, in only some things. Nothing is truer than the fact that all educated people are agnostic in some things. Is there any one who knows God unto perfection; who does not know in part, and who never sees through a glass darkly?

The honest, competent searcher after truth sometimes gets to the place where the only honest thing he can say is: I do not know.

But Huxley's attitude towards God and religion was not altogether doubtful and negative. He said some of the best things on the subject of religion and morality that have been said by scientists or by any other writers. Take this quotation: "Science seems to me to teach in the highest and strongest manner the Christian conception of the entire surrender to the will of God."

Anti-evolutionist, be honest with these words: is there any atheism in them? Can you find any fault with them?

His biographer says that in 1885 Huxley formulated "the perfect ideal of religion" in a passage which has become almost famous, namely: "In the 8th century B. C. in the heart of a world of idolatrous polytheists the Hebrew prophets put forth a conception of religion which appears to be as wonderful an inspiration of genius as the art of Pheidias or the science of Aristotle: 'And what doth the Lord require

of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.' "

Again Huxley says: "Atheism on purely philosophical grounds is untenable." One of the greatest utterances of Huxley is this: "But if it is certain that we can have no knowledge of the nature of either matter or spirit, and that the notion of necessity is sometimes illegitimately thrust into the perfectly legitimate conception of law, *the materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas.*" (Italics mine.)

If materialism can get any comfort out of that statement it is welcome to it.

Huxley declares that "the order of nature is ascertainable by our own faculties to an extent which is practically unlimited, and that *our volition counts for something as a condition of the course of events.*" (Italics mine.) *Lay Sermons and Addresses* — pages 144-145. This is a most significant utterance, and its force is needed today. Today we need to emphasize the great truth—"that our volition counts for some-

thing as a condition of the course of events." A great lack upon the part of the people today is trained wills, the practice of that self-constraint which will enable a man to round out his own life beautifully and heroically, and give himself unselfishly to the service of others. A great curse is on the world today because so many people are doing that which is right in their own eyes utterly unmindful and indifferent to the rights of others. Murders, drunkenness, and reckless driving which often end in death proceed from a lack of constraint, a lack of will-power, as well as from brutal selfishness.

If Huxley said some pretty strong things against the theology of his day, remember, it was against only one phase of theology, a phase that is unreasonable and absurd. Some of that unreasonableness in theology we find at the present time. For instance: if men represented God's dealing with man in a manner that is more applicable to a demon than a God, it is not surprising that Huxley should say I do not believe in that kind of God nor that kind of religion.

The representations of God as if he were a

demon are largely responsible for much of the agnosticism in the world, or the indifference to the church, and ministers are partly to blame. In Boston some years ago a certain minister visited the church of "Father Taylor," of the Seaman's Mission, and was invited to preach. He preached a kind of sermon you sometimes hear today, in which he made it appear that God is a Being more of wrath than of justice and mercy, and consigns more than three-fourths of the human race to an everlasting hell. When the service was over he asked Father Taylor what he thought of the sermon. Father Taylor replied: "My brother, your God is my devil."

Some ministers represent God in such terms today; consider this declaration of Dr. I. M. Haldeman, a prominent New York minister, as reported in the *Literary Digest:* "Christ is coming with the eye of one who is aroused and indignant, in whose Being beats the pulse of a hot anger. He comes forth as one who no longer seeks either friendship or love. . . . . His garments are dipped in blood, the blood of others. He descends that He may shed the blood of

men. He will enunciate his claims by terror and might. He will write it in the blood of his foes. * * * He comes to his glory, not as the Saviour, meek and lowly, not through the suffrage of willing hearts and plaudits of a welcoming world, but as a king, an autocrat, a despot, through the gushing blood of a trampled world."

There is much more to the same effect.

Note the blood-thirstiness, the wrath, the mercilessness of this supposed king and autocrat. Is there any wonder that men of science and many thousands of others who are not scientists, men in all walks of life, men of common sense and good will, refuse to believe in such a religion? It is just such horrid descriptions of religion as referred to above that have driven many people to antagonism or indifference to the church.

Huxley was scorned, criticised, and condemned by just such narrowness and unreasonableness in his day; but in spite of it he remained a friend to ministers, he believed in the church, spoke good strong words in behalf of morality, and made it as plain as words can

make it that he did not believe in scientific materialism.

Another popular writer on evolution was Professor Henry Drummond. No fair-minded man who knows the meaning of words can read his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World, The Ascent of Man, The Greatest Thing in the World and Other Addresses,* and then say he was an atheist and a traducer of the morals of the people. Unless men read the works of evolutionists, and note their statements of belief in God, morality, and religion they have no moral right to sit in judgment on these works: they have no moral right to class these men with atheists, haters of God and religion. Our courts of law would not think of condemning a man without a hearing. Let us not condemn Darwin, Huxley, Drummond, LeConte, and others without first carefully reading their writings. The editor of one of our leading papers says it seems that some people "would rather rave than read."

Let me make two brief quotations from Professor Drummond which shows the trend of his thought on evolution and religion: In his

Natural Law in the Spiritual World, page 30, he says: "No single fact in science has ever discredited a fact in religion."

In the chapter on "Involution" in *The Ascent of Man,* page 343, he says: "Christianity struck into the evolutionary process with no noise or shock; it upset nothing of all that had been done; it took all the natural foundations precisely as it found them; it adopted man's body, mind and soul at the exact level where organic evolution was at work upon them; it carried on the building by slow and gradual modifications; and, through processes, governed by rational laws, it put the finishing touches to the ascent of man."

Is there any opposition to religion in this? All his works are full of the reverent spirit, a profound interest in all that is beautiful and good.

Let us consider the writings on evolution of some of our countrymen in America. Let us begin with John Fiske, for a number of years a teacher in Harvard University, and afterwards in Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. His writings on scientific and religious subjects

have been widely read in this country and Europe. They are deservedly popular. In his books on *Outline of Cosmic Philosophy, Based on the Doctrine of Evolution.* (2 vols.) *The Destiny of Man Viewed in the Light of His Origin,* and in his other works he sets forth his beliefs about natural laws, the idea of God, and the destiny of the soul of man. Running through it all is a healthy, religious spirit. Over and over again he says in effect and in words: "Evolution is God's way of doing things."

Another great and greatly honored teacher of evolution was Joseph LeConte. Born in Liberty County, Georgia, a graduate of Franklin College, Ga., and afterwards of Harvard College, he was for a number of years a teacher in his *Alma Mater,* and afterwards gave many years of his life as Professor of Geology in the University of California. His most noted works are *Elements of Geology* and *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought.* The latter is one of the greatest books on theistic evolution in existence. No one who wants to know the bearing of science on religious thought should fail to read this book that is found in

most public libraries. Dr. Buckham in his very interesting little book *Religion as Experience,* pages 82-83, says: "It is already clear that the name of Joseph LeConte is to grow more and more luminous and his works are to follow him with the increasing influence of an assured reputation. * * * A book written at the suggestion of Henry Ward Beecher which won the approval, on the side of science, of Professor Romanes, and on that of religion of Bishop Gore, has sufficient external commendation. But, far more than that, it has the almost unique distinction of combining a thoroughly comprehensible interpretation of evolution and a clear, free, and at times, profound treatise on theology." A quotation will give you some idea of the spirit of its author. LeConte insists that whenever we get behind physical phenomena we find psychical phenomena. Is it unreasonable to believe that behind all physical phenomena there is mind, Soul? In *Evolution and Religious Thought,* page 316, he says: "In the only place where we do get behind physical phenomena, namely, the brain, we find psychical phenomena. Are we not justified, then,

in concluding that in all cases the psychical lies behind the physical?"

His chapters on the "Relation of Evolution to Materialism," "The Relation of God to Nature," "The Relation of God to Man" are all that any theist could ask of evolution.

With the possible exception of one or two teachers of biology in America, the whole teaching force, many thousands, can be put down as favoring a theistic, a spiritual, interpretation of the origin of the universe over against scientific materialism. This is a plain matter of counting noses. Some months ago Dr. Sherwood Eddy, a noted missionary and religious worker among college students, said in a public address: "We have to believe in evolution because there are so many facts in support of it. I believe in God, Christ, the Bible, and also in evolution. As far as I know all botanists, zoologists, doctors, and preachers believe in evolution."

But it may be asked: Have there not been some scientists who have taught that there is no need for the conception of God behind physical phenomena? Undoubtedly, yes. In every

generation since evolution has been advocated as the explanation of the origin of animal forms, including man, a few scientists have taken the atheistic view. But the overwhelming majority have expressed themselves against materialism and atheism. No one has put the case stronger than Huxley: "The materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas." This is the view of scientists today with one or two exceptions. But what of these exceptions? Is it fair, is it reasonable to denounce as atheistic a theory that has never been called atheistic except by a very few scientists? When the rank and file of scientists in every generation have declared that evolution is not materialism nor atheism; that spirit, not matter is the power behind the laws of nature, is it a fair way of dealing with the facts to say that a few scientists must decide the question in favor of atheism? Do we act that way in other important matters?

Without any sort of doubt the vast majority of women are good at heart and in practice.

Shall we throw suspicion upon the whole sisterhood because some few are worse than demons?

I have been intimately associated with ministers of religion for forty years. For strength of character, moral earnestness, pure heartedness and serviceableness to the community there is no class of men superior. None. Are you going to throw the whole fraternity overboard because a few of them are black sheep? Are you going to stigmatize as atheists, infidels, the whole teaching force in our high schools and universities, besides thousands of ministers, laymen and laywomen who are evolutionists because a few, a very few, scientists are atheists? Be honest with the facts. Be fair in your arguments.

Hundreds of ministers and laymen in every denomination in this country have written books and published sermons to show the wonder and the beauty of God's work in gradually developing the higher forms of life from the lower. In the face of all these facts how can any fair-minded, educated man say that evolution is another name for atheism?

Call to mind the long list of presidents of our universities, professors in our theological seminaries, honored and very serviceable ministers in the prominent pulpits of the country, besides many thousands of church workers in all denominations. How reckless must be the man who could say that these are disbelievers in God and the Bible, and are undermining the morals of our youth!

Who are evolutionists? I have shown in this chapter most conclusively from their own writings that they are not atheists nor the corruptors of morals. Not President-Emeritus Eliot and President Lowell of Harvard University, nor Faunce of Brown, nor Butler of Columbia, nor Professor Conklin of Princeton, nor Needham of Cornell, nor Spangler of West Virginia, among scientists; nor Rev. Drs. Abbott, Samuel A. Eliot, of Boston, Cadman, Forsdick, Veder, among Protestant ministers; nor the leaders of the Catholic church, many of whom are evolutionists; not Rabbis Wise, Fineshriber, Calisch and Kohler, among our Jewish brethren; nor a splendid array of good men and women in the humbler walks of life. None of

these are atheists nor the corruptors of our youth.

Who are evolutionists? I challenge comparison. Look around you in any community and compare the men and women who are evolutionists with those who are not. In intelligence, character, godliness, and good works they are in no respect inferior to their brethren who are not evolutionists.

In view of these quotations and other facts the man who can say that evolutionists are atheists can say anything he *wishes* to say. What he says is not the reasoned deduction from facts and principles, but is predominently a matter of *will.*

Herman Lotze, a great scientist and scholar, voices the sentiments of evolutionists in this splendid thought:

"Love for the living God, and longing to be approved by him, is the scientific as it is the Christian basis of morality; and science can not find a firmer basis nor life a surer."

CHAPTER III

WHO ARE THE ANTI-EVOLUTIONISTS?

THE men and women who oppose evolution are usually good, honest, sincere people. I do not question their motive nor their sincerity. I know thousands of them, and I know them to be as pure-hearted, as loyal to the great principles of righteousness, as good neighbors and friends as one can find anywhere on earth. But they are not a whit better than other people who do not believe as they do, and they have no special faculty by which to discover the truth.

Some of them are making claims or implications which the facts do not justify. They are holding out the idea that they, and they alone, are peculiarly the great champions of truth, the great lovers and defenders of the Bible, and that they are trying to save the youth of the land, while evolutionists are doing just the opposite.

Who are these men that are making such mighty claims? Let us look at the subject in kindness and fairness. Let us consider their past and present achievements, and see if there is any reason to believe that they are especially endowed with powers that enable them to apprehend the truth more clearly than their fellows on the other side. Is there among these opponents of evolution any one who has accomplished anything peculiarly great in statesmanship? Are there any, who, after thirty or forty years of earnest study of science have written any great works on science? If so, what are the names of the men, and what books did they write? If there are such serviceable men they ought to be known, and people ought to have the opportunity to read their books. Look into these questions, and answer them at the bar of unprejudiced reason.

When you study these men I think you will find there is no reason to believe they have any peculiarly great endowments that enable them to see and understand, better than others, the great problems which we are discussing. They have not given any special, systematic study

to these subjects, and they have not had any training in the laboratories.

All that can be truthfully said of the foremost of these anti-evolutionists is that they are men of good minds and of excellent moral character.

The anti-evolutionists may be divided into several classes. The first class is a very large one, who have not studied the subject at all, and do not claim to have studied it. They have not had the time for study, or they have not taken the time to give to a candid, serious study of the claims of evolution. All they have ever heard is from some minister or lecturer who is prejudiced on the subject, and who has no claim to a thorough knowledge of the subject. The sum and substance of what the people have heard on the subject is this: "I don't believe that I am descended from a monkey." "The Bible says God made man in his own image, and I believe the Bible."

Evolutionists as well as anti-evolutionists believe that man was made in the image of God. The question at issue is, what was God's method of making man's body? The supreme aim of the ministers and lecturers in their

anti-evolution attacks seems to be to raise a laugh about "Our monkey ancestors that once had tails." This is the stock-in-trade argument also of some newspapers. Cut out the ridicule and very little is left. But evolution can not be laughed out of court. The world must meet the issues with sober arguments.

There is another class of objectors to evolution. These oppose it because the doctrine is new, comparatively new. Opposition to the new and untried is commendable, if it is not carried too far. The Bible injunction, "Prove all things. Hold fast to that which is good," is a very wholesome principle. But to oppose the new simply because it is new, and to refuse to look into the claims of the new is not wholesome. The human race has progressed in knowledge and in material resources because they dared to try out the new. We are trying out the new every day in other departments of life. In the realm of science we will continue to try out the new in our search for the hidden truth of God. Einstein's theory of the relativity of space and a limited universe is something new — some parts of it. Governments are today spending

thousands of dollars in trying out the theory. Let us not close the doors of our minds to the new. The supreme thought ought to be, is it true?

There is another class of anti-evolutionists who have given the subject some thought, but who are not convinced. They believe sincerely that species is the limit of variation, and that God made all the species by special acts of creation. But they are not bitter against their opponents. They are willing to live and let live. They believe that the evolutionist is sincere, intelligent, and honest in his beliefs, and that his beliefs do not necessarily eliminate God from the universe. They believe that evolutionists are the children of God, and heirs to the same inheritance they claim for themselves.

There is still another class of anti-evolutionists. I hope it is a very small class. They are very bitter, unreasonable, and uncharitable. It is the same type of man that killed witches in New England, drove the Baptists out of Massachusetts into Rhode Island, and the Quakers into other parts of the country.

A certain man belonging to this type of

anti-evolutionists said of a minister who is an evolutionist: "Such as he ought to have kerosene poured all over him, and a lighted match stuck to him."

A certain woman wrote to a teacher who had spoken in favor of evolution: "When you die I hope you will go to hell,and I hope your soul will shrivel up like a drop of water on a red-hot stove." Wonderful! Wonderful! "How can such wrath dwell in celestial minds!"

From a candid study of this phase of the subject we can see clearly that the anti-evolutionist has no vantage ground from which to form his opinions on the subject. He is not better educated, and he is not better trained than his opponents. His utterances proclaim the fact that he has not a better spirit, the spirit of "sweet reasonableness." Therefore, let us consider the subject on its merits. The thing of supreme consideration is: What are the facts? Is evolution true, or even probably or possibly true?

Does it really eliminate God from the universe?

Does it really destroy the great foundation

principles of morality and religion which we find in the Bible? Has the anti-evolutionist any more right than the evolutionist to say:

"Holy Bible, book divine,
Precious treasure, thou art mine?"

CHAPTER IV

EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE

WITHOUT any sort of doubt the Bible is a great source of morality and religion. It is guiding millions of people on their way toward God. It is the way of life to the souls of men. In addition to this it is wonderfully interesting and beautiful literature. For these most excellent reasons every lover of righteousness, every lover of the human race should feel it his sacred duty to help keep the Bible unimpaired — keep it as it is, the greatest religious book of the ages.

I have studied the Bible for forty years, and have preached it with all the power of my being. I am a thorough-going evolutionist. I have studied the works of Historical Criticism of the Bible, and I know the spirit of the men who have discussed it from that standpoint. Theirs is the spirit of reverence, the spirit of the deepest appreciation. I know I am not

mistaken in my own feelings about the Bible, and I am sure of the deep appreciation and love of the higher critics. It is not a question as to whether the literalists or the higher critics appreciate the Bible. Both of them appreciate it. Both desire that the Bible have its fullest force on the lives of men. It is simply a question of which one has seen the Bible in its truest light — in keeping with the real facts which we find in the Bible itself.

It is not surprising that some people having been taught that the Bible is literally true in all its parts and literally true on all subjects should look upon any other interpretation as an effort to discredit the Bible, and destroy its influence. They say the Bible teaches that man was "made" in the image of God. For thousands of years the words "make" and "create" had no other meaning than to bring into existence with one's hands in a few minutes, hours or days. So when evolutionists began to teach that making and creating occupied untold ages, and that it was not necessary to assume that God made things with his hands and fingers, but through the laws of nature as secondary causes,

it is not surprising that some people should look upon this view of things as contrary to the Bible, and a denial of its truth and its value.

That the literal interpretation of the Bible is not true, not in keeping with the statements in the Bible itself, not in keeping with what we know of geography, geology, and astronomy, can be abundantly seen by careful study.

Let us consider the literalists' interpretation of that famous verse in the first chapter of Genesis: "God created man in his own image and likeness." What is meant by the image of God? Do the literalists mean that God has the same bodily shape as man, only a great deal bigger? Do they mean that man's bodily shape is like God's?

Is it not a fact, rather, that the "image of God" means man's spiritual likeness to God? Man is called "a child of God." Is not that true because of man's spiritual likeness? Is it not because man is a soul; has intellect, sensibility, and will; has consciousness, love, hatred of wrong, all of which are kin to the powers and attributes of God? Men are no longer speaking of God in terms of bodily form.

"God is spirit," without form. His existence is co-extensive with the whole universe.

The literalists, the anti-evolutionists, say the Bible teaches that the world and all things therein were made in six days of twenty-four hours, about five thousand years ago, and that, therefore, the scientists are doing a wicked thing to teach that the earth is millions of years old, and men hundreds of thousands of years old. They tell us with sincere and pious ardor that when scientists teach doctrines that contradict the Bible we must follow the Bible, not books on science. That sounds very religious and "safe." That argument had a great deal more force and pertinency in the infancy of science when the only way of interpreting the Bible was to look upon all its statements as literal, scientific, and historical truth. But how educated men can, today, advise people to take the Bible view of creation instead of the scientific view is beyond my comprehension. In the history of man there is no truth plainer than this: There is not a statement in the Bible about the size of the earth, the shape of the earth, the revolutions of the earth and the

other planets and stars that has not been most thoroughly disproved by science. The most certain fact in history is that the Bible is not a handbook of science. There is not a book in the Bible whose statements on scientific subjects are in keeping with what we *know* of science today. The Bible was not written in the interest of science. Its supreme aim all the way through was morality and religion. Bible writers took the current view of the shape, size, etc., of the earth and of the origin of man. But note this difference: when they wrote about origins they had a higher and nobler vision of truth. Take, for instance, the first and second chapters of Genesis. It seems on the face of it that the editor who put together these two different accounts of creation was not interested in scientific or historic accuracy. These inaccuracies are on the face of these chapters. You do not have to resort to the subtilties of the logician or metaphyscian in order to perceive them. On the first day God is said to have made light and darkness, and the light he called day, and the darkness night. What do we know about day and night except as it relates

to our planet turned to or from the sun? And yet we are told that the sun, moon, and stars were not made until the fourth day. According to the first verse light and darkness, night and day existed *without any help from the sun.* According to the second account on the fourth day light and darkness, night and day existed *because* of the sun, moon, and stars.

Read these different accounts slowly, and carefully, and form your own opinion of the facts.

According to the first account in the first chapter in Genesis, man was made after the lower animals were made. According to the second account in the second chapter man was made first, the lower animals afterwards. Which account is correct?

These statements are not quibblings. They are not written in the spirit of fault-finding. Here are statements which some people suppose were written with scientific and historical accuracy. Does complete accuracy seem to have been the ruling thought in the mind of the writer? No, but the two things of supreme importance in this beautiful poem of creation are,

first, that *God* made the heaven and the earth. However it had been made, whatever may have been the order of creation, (and the order as we have seen is different in the two accounts), but however the order, *God* made the heaven and the earth and all things therein.

The next great thought and purpose in the creation story was to emphasize and enforce the sanctity of the Sabbath—a day of rest. God worked six days, and *rested* on the Sabbath, the seventh day, therefore the Sabbath is a holy day, and must be used as a day of rest, because God rested, and sanctified it. This seems to have been the thought in the mind of the writer. It is plain he was not interested in scientific or historical accuracy about light and darkness, the order of creation, and whether it was really a fact that day and night were independent of the sun, or were caused by the sun. This view is supported by the fact the Babylonians and Chaldeans had accounts of creation similar to the Genesis account, and their accounts antedate the Genesis account. In other words the Hebrews borrowed from their Babylonian and Chaldean neighbors. But in the

Babylonian and Chaldean accounts it was a demi-god, with different names, sometimes called Thoth, and not the God of the Universe that made all things. This great Hebrew, however, wrote some things finer and truer. He said, not a demi-god, but the Supreme Being made the heaven and the earth. This was the first clear utterance in the history of man of the creation of all things by the Supreme Deity. The account of creation in the first and second chapters of Genesis is unique in the fact that while all other accounts were mixed with crude heathen speculations it comes out clearly and distinctly in its affirmation of the one Supreme God as the ultimate cause of world phenomena.

He meant, also, to glorify the Sabbath day, and enforce its observance by saying — God rested on the seventh day. It is a holy day.

Another evidence that the Bible is not a book of science is found in Lev. 11:5: The coney, a species of hare, is referred to as "chewing its cud." Writers on zoology declare, after most careful investigation, that the coney does not chew its cud, and never did.

Another remarkable declaration is in Joshua

10:13: "And the sun stood still, and the moon was stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, *and hasted not to go down about a whole day.*"

It is as plain as anything can be that the man who wrote the above passage believed the old astronomy which said the sun revolved around the earth, and that the earth stood still. Since it is a fact now and was a fact then, that day and night are caused by the revolution of the earth on its axis what difference would it have made if the sun had stood still not only a whole day but forty days? Day and night would have continued just the same. The statement would have had some meaning, and would have been in keeping with the facts of astronomy if the writer had said God caused the *earth* to stand still.

It was nothing against the intelligence of the writer of that far away time who believed that the sun revolved around the earth. The whole world was in ignorance on the subject. But what are we to think of the man who today

will defend the position in Joshua that God causing the sun to stand still added about twenty-four hours of daylight to the already existing day? It is hard to be patient with a man who shuts his eyes to obvious facts in order to support an imaginary inerrant Bible.

Ah, there is the rub! No matter how many and how plain the facts, the man bent on proving an inerrant Bible simply brushes them aside.

But there are millions of young men and women, a great number of them college students, who are not prejudiced against facts. Our appeal is to them. What, I ask, are the real facts in the case. What is the truth?

Another scientific inaccuracy is found in I Corinthians, 15:34,35, concerning the burial and resurrection of the body. In spite of the fact that the man who asked the question was called "a fool," nevertheless, Paul's argument is not convincing. A great many of the best Bible scholars admit that Paul's illustration did not illustrate. "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." Just the reverse of that is true. If seed that is sown dies *it never comes up.* Every farmer and

gardener knows this to be true. Every year farmers have to replant some of the seed they have sown because very damp, cold weather killed the germ.

Every one who has studied the subject knows these to be the facts: when the grain is planted the warmth and moisture of the earth softens the food that surrounds the germ and enables it to take up the food into itself, and grow. Then it takes up whatever other food the roots can find, and the plant grows into stalk and fruit. *But the seed does not die.*

Furthermore, the soul of man does not grow out of his dead body like a stalk of wheat grows out of the seed that is planted. Many ministers of all denominations say this analogy of Paul's is a mistaken analogy. The soul of man exists long before the body dies. This is as plain a fact as anything can be.

The author of the 119th Psalm evidently believed that the sun raced round the earth, for he said: "The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoices as a strong man to run a race."

Several hundred years ago when astronomy

was making its great fight to prove the earth is round, the churchman said: "That can not be, for the Bible speaks of 'the four corners of the earth!' How can the earth be round, and have four corners?" So they stuck to the theory that the earth is flat.

Read Dr. Andrew D. White's two volumes on *The Warfare of Science with Theology,* and you will be surprised to see how persistently the churchmen opposed science in favor of the Bible, and in every instance they failed. They opposed the science of medicine, but favored witchcraft and demonology as an explanation of diseases.

They opposed Franklin's lightning-rod because it interferred with the doctrine of special providence.

They opposed Newton's theory of gravitation, because it interferred with their doctrine that the heavenly bodies were moved around their orbits by the hands of angels.

It is surprising and painful to see that nearly every step of scientific progress was opposed by the church, or by laymen advocating the inerrancy of the Bible. In every one of these

instances the doctrine of an inerrant Bible lost its case, and science won. This ought to be enough to show that the Bible must not be taken literally, and that it is not a book on science.

But anti-evolutionists say we are not fair when we put them in the same class with the opponents of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and others. I appeal to students throughout the world today to judge whether we are fair when we say that the anti-evolutionists today are of the same type of mind, and use the same methods and arguments as did the opponents of Copernicus, Galileo and others.

They quote the same scriptures, and call them inerrant.

They quote the same scriptures, and say they are scientifically correct.

They make identically the same assumption that God could not have inspired any other kind of a book but an inerrant book.

They make the same charge against their opponents, the evolutionists, namely, that they seek to destroy the value of the Bible, and undermine the morality of the people, especially, the young.

They have the same intolerant spirit as manifested by their efforts to shut the mouths of their opponents by turning them out of their professorships. Like their colleagues in the time of Copernicus they are not in favor of academic freedom. They manifest the same kind of effrontery when they assert as their colleagues did, two or three hundred years ago, that their position is the *only* one that honors God or saves the soul. No matter how evident it is that their opponents, the evolutionists, are among the most intelligent, best-beloved, most loyal to truth and honor, most serviceable men and women on earth, helping to solve the world's problems and bear its burdens, they nevertheless class them as atheists, infidels, and agnostics. These characterizations are the favorite ones used by their colleagues centuries ago.

I do not accept the plea of the anti-evolutionists that they are not to be classed with the opponents of Copernicus and others because their theories have been proven true while evolution has not been proven true. The truth is, the main facts of evolution are as well

established as the doctrines of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton. The proof of this assertion will be considered at length in the chapter on the Evidences of Evolution. Let it suffice to quote here the words of Joseph LeConte, a great scientist and an enthusiastic believer in God and religion. In his book on *Evolution and Religion,* page 66, he says:

"Evolution is, therefore, no longer a school of thought. The words *evolutionism* and *evolutionist* ought not any longer to be used, any more than *gravitationism* and *gravitationist;* for the law of evolution is as certain as the law of gravitation. Nay, it is far more certain. The connection between successive events in time (causation) is far more certain than the connection between co-existent objects in space (gravitation)."

The people are really learning something from the past. The masses of the people are better educated than formerly, and they dare to think for themselves. They have been told by anti-scientists so often that science is destroying the Bible and religion, only to find out afterwards that the anti-scientists were mis-

taken, that they now prefer to look into these things themselves.

The Catholic Church which used to be conservative in matters of science and the Bible are today more progressive than some Protestants in their interpretation of science and the Historical Criticism. They say these scientific positions do not imperil the soul; that men can be evolutionists and Higher Critics, and still be the children of God. I quote the following clear and splendid thought from an eminent Catholic authority. "The doctrine of evolution is no more in opposition to the Catholic Church than is the Copernican theory or that of Galileo." Dr. Andrew White, *History Warfare of Science with Theology,* Vol. 1, page 82. What a striking contrast these words are to those of Martin Luther: "People give ear to an upstart astrologer (Copernicus) who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun and moon. * * * This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred scriptures tell us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and

not the earth." Dr. White's *Warfare of Science with Theology,* Vol 1, page 126.

But Copernicus was not such a "fool" after all.

Unfortunately there is a type of mind that never learns anything from the past. One good thing about Einstein's theory of *The Relativity of Space and a Limited Universe* is people do not know enough about it to raise an objection! My prophecy is that when, in future years, there is even a small general knowledge of it some one will object to the theory on Bible grounds. They will endeavor to show that it is against God, the Bible, and religion. Then when this theory has won the day, as it surely will, and the earnest students of nature shall discover some other great truth, again some people will come forth, and say, it can not be true: it destroys God, the Bible and religion.

A great outcry has been made against evolution because it teaches man's descent from lower forms of animals. What, they ask, do you mean to say that there is brute blood in my veins, and my child's veins? This part of the subject will be discussed at greater length

in another chapter. Let me quote the Bible just here to show that it has some very strong words paralleling man's life with that of the brute. Read Ecclesiastes 3:18,19. "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth the beast; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other. Yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no *pre-eminence* above a beast." I trust the anti-evolutionist will not throw away his Bible because of these strong words showing our likeness to the beast.

In Psalms 49:12 we have this: "Nevertheless, man being in honor abideth not; he is like the beasts that perish."

It is easy to see that when Darwin and other scientists claim that man has much in common with the beast, the whole theory can not be thrown overboard by saying that everything in the Bible contradicts it. Here are two passages which show that man has much in common with the brute. The Bible does not affirm

man's descent from lower forms, but it is not afraid or ashamed to affirm that man has much in common with the brute.

Evolutionists believe in the Bible. They preach it and evolution, too. They write books showing what they believe to be the greater thought of God as He has gone about His work, patiently and persistently through the ceaseless ages. The Bible itself is a result of evolution, and God was in the evolution. At first the Hebrews thought of God as a tribal God. He was God of the Hebrews, God of the Israelites, and they had no thought of His being the God of all people. He was spoken of as "Our God," in contrast to the gods of other tribes. This fact is made plain by the tenth chapter of Joshua where it is stated that God made the sun to stand still a whole day in order that Joshua and his army might have more time to slay what was said to be "the enemies of the Lord." And such slaughter! Nothing that the Germans or Turks did in the late war surpassed it. Read it, and then remember that all this was done by the command of God. Can you believe it? Is it not saner to believe that these Hebrews, in that far away time, had crude ideas of God — just such ideas as other tribes and nations had?

But Israel rose out of this, and reached that glorious period where it taught the doctrine that God is not only the God of the Israelites, but the God of the whole world. The great prophet, Malachi, asks: "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light," Isaiah 60:3. "And they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles." Isaiah 66:19. At first the Hebrews looked upon their neighbors as enemies. They said if you find an animal that died of itself sell it to your neighbor; do not eat it yourself. Out of this they rose to the finest expressions of neighborly love and good will which have ever been expressed by the lips of man, culminating in that most beautiful and stimulating verse, Leviticus 19:18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

At first the Hebrews practiced human sacrifice and animal sacrifice as did their neighbors, and part of the time they worshiped idols as did the people around them. Out of this they rose to the highest conceptions of spiritual worship, the most beautiful and heartfelt devotion to the one only true God. Out of this came that

moral, that humane, that spiritual insight which gave us the Ten Commandments, the Forty-second and other Psalms, the great moral exhortations of the prophets, the Beatitudes of Jesus, the 13th chapter of I Corinthians and many other noble and inspiring passages.

Read the sermons of evolutionists. Read their books. Be as just as our courts of law, do not judge your opponent unheard. You will find that the evolutionists have just as high and holy a place for the Bible, and God, and religion as any one. They do not teach that the Bible is a book of science, but they show that it is the greatest book in the wide world in its teachings of God and morality and religion.

CHAPTER V

THE BIBLE NOT AN INERRANT BOOK

MUCH has been written on the "inerrancy and the "infallibility" of the Bible. Sometimes more heat has been produced than light. Some writers speak of the "infallibility" and the "inerrancy" of the Bible as if both words meant the same thing. It will help us to understand the subject a little better if we will give some study to those words. The words do not mean the same thing. When it is said that the "Bible is an infallible rule of faith and practice," that is a truth which no one will gainsay, but that does not mean that the Bible is inerrant. The words "infallible" and "inerrant" are not in the Bible. The idea of sufficiency or infallibility is found in such scriptures as II Timothy 3:15: "All scripture inspired of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Another excellent passage is

found in Isaiah, 55:11: "It (my word) shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." This we know to be true, and no one wishes to deny it. We know that the Ten Commandments are so plain, so unmistakingly true; that the great Psalms, the great exhortations of the prophets, the Beatitudes of Jesus and a vast wealth of other scriptures are so forceful and persuasive, so plainly voicing the thought of God, that they are infallibly true. They are so plainly a revelation of God that we say in Bible language " a wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein."

The infallibility of the Bible means that if a man reads the Bible carefully, for the purpose of religious guidance, and finds it not, the fault is his, not the Bible's. There is enough truth and inspiration in the passages I have referred to above to save every man born into the world. But that does not mean that the Bible is infallible in matters of science and history, or inerrant in other respects.

The doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible as that word was used by some of the greatest

fathers of the church will remain unharmed by any amount of criticism. Evolutionists bring against it no word of reproach. But the doctrine of *inerrancy* of the Bible is dead past resurrection. All the anti-evolutionists in the world with their "peerless" oratory can not restore it to life. It died an unmistakably certain death when the "friends" of the Bible insisted vehemently that the Bible taught the earth was flat, and the center of our planetary system, and the "infidel" scientists proved that the earth is a sphere, and revolves around the sun. The literalists made belief in the inerrancy of the Bible impossible when they upheld witchcraft on Bible grounds; when they upheld slavery on Bible grounds; when they opposed gravitation on Bible grounds. In a word they made belief in an inerrant Bible impossible when they opposed nearly every truth of science that has ever been put forth — opposed it in behalf of a supposedly inerrant Bible.

Astruc, a French medical writer, aided by thousands of worthy ministers of religion and professors of theology helped to put to death this false doctrine of an inerrant Bible by

showing that there are sometimes two or three or four different accounts of the same events, and that these different accounts can not be reconciled. These differences are so plain that no fair-minded man can fail to see them when pointed out. I do not claim that these differences are so great that they injure the great foundations of vital moral and religious truth, but they are great enough to destroy the false doctrine of an inerrant Bible.

Let us take up the Bible, and see what these differences are, and what the writers themselves have to say about their knowledge of things. Nowhere do they claim to be inerrant. Paul says, I Cor. 13:9-12: "For now we know in part, and we prophesy in part. Now we see through a glass darkly." If you will read Galatians 2:11-14, you will find that Paul "Withstood Peter to his face, because Peter was to be blamed." Paul says that Peter "*dissembled,*" and caused others to "*dissemble.*" He also says that they did not walk "uprightly." Now is it not as plain as can be that either Peter or Paul was in error? There was "blame" or lack of "uprightness" somewhere.

Again Paul says, Phil. 3:12: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect."

Paul here distinctly disclaims perfection. There is no Bible writer that claims inerrancy of utterance.

There is only one writer who calls down a curse upon any one who would alter "the word of this prophecy," and that is found in Rev. 22:19. But the reference is only to that book, Revelation.

The inerrancy of the Bible is not taught either by Catholics or the early Protestants. Dr. Briggs, in his book *The Bible, the Church, and the Reason,* shows that Origen, Jerome, St. Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Baxter and many others never taught such doctrine, but distinctly points out some of the errors. Whatever one may think of the significance or insignificance of these errors, they are nevertheless errors.

In order that we may see more clearly the different statements in the Bible about the same events I will put a few of them in parallel columns: they are plain contradictions:

"And David's heart smote him after that he had numbered the people. And David said unto the Lord, I have sinned greatly in that I have done."

II Samuel 24:10.

(That is, in numbering the people he had "sinned greatly." So that makes *two* sins he committed.)

"David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside (*in anything*) that he commanded him all the days of his life, save *only* in the matter of Uriah, the Hittite."

I Kings 15:5.

"And it came to pass after these things, that God did (tempt) Abraham."

Genesis 22:1.

"Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God can not be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man."

James 1:13.

"O Lord, thou hast deceived me and I was deceived.

Jer. 20:7.

"The earth abideth forever."

Ec. 1:4.

"The earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up."

II Peter 3:10.

"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; he can not sin because he is born of God."

I John 3:9.

"There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not."

Ec. 7:20.

"Michal, the daughter of Saul, had *no* child unto the day of her death."

II Sam. 6:23.

"The five sons of Michal, the daughter of Saul."

II Sam. 21:8.

"He that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more."

Job. 7:9.

"The trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised."

I Cor. 15:52.

Get your Bible, and look up these passages.

There are many more contradictions both in the Old Testament and the New. How serious these contradictions which I have given above let each man judge for himself. But they are flat contradictions, and you can not brush them away. He is a very poor friend of the Bible and the young men in our colleges who holds out the idea that the Bible is inerrant, that it has no historical or scientific contradictions. The best and surest way of getting and keeping the confidence of people is to tell them plainly the truth and nothing but the truth about the Bible. The Bible has truth, and beauty, and goodness enough to take care of itself.

Evolution and the Higher Criticism make no effort to destroy or lessen its value.

One of the favorite arguments of the literalists against admitting that there is one error, one contradiction, one mistaken analogy in the Bible is that if the Bible is "false in one thing it is false in all." No student of the Bible has

ever charged that the contradictions in the Bible are the result of deliberate purposeful lying. They are accounted for on an entirely different principle. Let us consider that rule by which testimony is judged which we find at Common Law — "False in one thing, false in all." This rule has a very limited application. In our courts of law today, if the witness makes plain the fact that he is deliberately lying, that, of course throws very grave suspicion on the other parts of his testimony, and the jury takes that fact into account. But the judge will tell the jury that though the witness may be lying in one part of his testimony it is possible that he is telling the truth in other parts. But if the witness is plainly not trying to give false testimony, but is simply mistaken in some of the details it does not even raise a suspicion against his testimony as a whole. For instance; suppose a witness says that a certain thing happened at ten o'clock in the morning, or eight, or twelve, and suppose it should be proven that it happened at nine o'clock; or suppose there was some other inaccuracy, it would not vitiate his testimony.

About the Bible there is no presumption of falsehood. As stated on another page much of the Bible is pure literature, and uses the forms of expression, the tropes, imagery, hyperbole that we find in all literature from the remotest times to the present day. These Bible writers wanted to illustrate and enforce some great moral and religious truth, and they put it in the form of a parable, or a story, or a poem like the poem of creation which we find in the first chapter of Genesis.

Furthermore, when the Bible was put together in its present form, it was put together by an editor or redactor. He found several documents describing the same events, written by different men, living in different parts of the country, and written at different times. Whether the editor noticed the contradictions in these different accounts we do not know; but instead of re-writing these different accounts he puts them together just as he found them, and there they are today in many parts of the Old Testament, in Genesis, in the other portions of the Hexateuch, Kings, Chronicles, and even in the New Testament.

But in none of these books is there any attempt at falsehood. So the statement that one must believe all the Bible as literal truth or none of it would find no justification in our courts of law where the rule "false in one thing, false in all" is rightly interpreted, nor does it find justification at the bar of common sense. We act with discretion and judgment in the complex affairs of human life. We do not throw away all good things because some things are not good. We do not discredit all history, all literature, all constitutions upon which governments are founded because there are weak spots.

Away, then, with the absurd idea, that we must throw away the whole Bible because there are contradictions and mistaken analogies. There are great mountain peaks of truth and beauty that stand out in the Bible like glorious beacons to guide the weary world in its search for God. Many millions of human beings have found the way of life, and were satisfied. And as this old earth goes circling on its tireless journey many millions more will find the light, the truth, the Holy Presence which they so much need. They are not going to be distressed nor

discouraged when they understand that the Bible was not written in the interest of astronomy, geography, electricity, botany and biology. The prayers of the Psalmist, the impassioned words of righteousness of the prophets, the everlasting "thou shalt not" as well as "thou shalt" — these are the things that nourish the soul. Believing that God is at least as good and wise as a good human being they have no hesitancy in refusing to look upon this verse from the Psalms as a divine truth: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Believing that God is as fair and honorable in his dealings as an ordinary butcher they refuse to believe that the writer in Deut. 13:21 voiced the mind of God when he said that if an animal was found dead that died of itself, the Israelites were not to eat it, *but that they "may sell it to an alien."* Believing that God is the Father of the whole human race, they find no difficulty in denying the divine authorship of the verse in the Psalm which says: "Happy shall he be, that taketh, and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." Psalm 137:9.

I would not tear a leaf out of the Bible. Let

it all remain just as it is showing the development of a most wonderful people from savagery to a most splendid culture and civilization; from idolatry to the noblest conceptions of a spiritual God, and from the cruel law of retaliation to the inspiring principles of justice and mercy. Let it stand just as it is with its errors and its truth, but let us have the sanity not to allow our love for this great book to blind us to new discoveries and plainer truth.

CHAPTER VI

SOME OF THE EVIDENCES OF EVOLUTION

IN THE preceding chapters I have endeavored to show that the rank and file of evolutionists are not atheists, but that they are just as intelligent, as competent, as moral, as spiritual, and they are as deeply interested in the moral and religious welfare of the people as any on the other side. I have also shown that they believe the Bible, they preach it, and they strive to live its great moral and religious precepts.

But have the evolutionists substantial truth on their side with respect to their claims that higher forms of life have come out of the lower forms of life by gradual changes from the lower to the higher? What are some of the evidences of evolution? Why do scientists insist that man was not made out of hand in a few minutes or hours as a child might make a mud doll?

Possibly God had the power to make man that way, or by the word of his mouth; but evolutionists say that that was not his method.

Many of the facts that evolutionists have placed before us are plain enough and comprehensible enough to enable any fair-minded man of ordinary intelligence to understand the subject. It is a mistake to say that only college graduates can grasp the main features of the subject. The plain people know enough about the facts of astronomy to enable them to believe that the earth is round, the sun is the center of our planetary system, and that the sun is about ninety-three million miles from the earth. The plain people may not be able to demonstrate these facts by the aid of the telescope and mathematics, but they can appreciate intelligent arguments of the men who are in a position to know, and they trust them. If people of ordinary intelligence do not accept the doctrine of evolution it is not because they are not able to grasp the main facts. Some of the facts and arguments are these:

FIRST: The fact that practically all scientists believe it.

When a theory has been in the field of discussion for several hundred years, and competent men have brought against it and in its behalf all the arguments which they command, if the theory comes out with the vast majority of competent critics on its side, it is certainly presumptive evidence of its truth.

From the beginning a few scientists have been against it, and at the present time there are possibly one or two scientists of note who oppose it, though I do not happen to know one. But it is a plain truth that practically all scientists of note, all teachers of botany and biology, and a very large number of leading ministers *in all denominations,* besides millions of laymen and laywomen in all walks of life believe the doctrine.

Another strong presumption in its favor is this: The men and women who believe in evolution, almost without exception, are the people who have given it careful study. In very many cases they did not at first believe it. They were prejudiced against it, but their study led them to accept it.

SECOND: In the many years of contest between science and the Historical Criticism on one side, and the literalists on the other side, scientists and the writers on Historical Criticism have never retreated from any important, essential position which they assumed. Age after age the victory has been with science. Every educated man knows this and even the plain people.

THIRD: The trust-worthiness of our leaders is another argument in favor of evolution. Millions of plain people can not demonstrate the law of gravitation that "all bodies attract each other directly according to their mass and inversely according to the square of their distances;" but they trust the men who can demonstrate that proposition, and they do not hesitate to believe in the laws of gravitation.

There are many other every-day truths of science which the people believe, though they are not able to demonstrate them by the aid of the microscope or telescope or by the rules of mathematics.

Science has told us the truth so often, and the people who interpreted the Bible literally

have been so often mistaken, that we are coming more and more to see that scientists are the leaders whom we can trust.

The literalists said the earth is flat. Scientists said, no, and scientists won. The literalists said the sun revolves around the earth. Scientists said, no, and scientists won.

The literalists said the angels move the planets around their orbits. Scientists said, no, it is gravitation, and scientists won.

The literalists said that man was made in a few moments or a few hours. Scientists said, no, it took ages by a very slow process. Again the facts before us seem to warrant the assertion that scientists have won.

FOURTH: Another argument in favor of evolution is the attitude of Jewish Rabbis in favor of the non-literal interpretation of the Old Testament. If the literal verbal interpretation of the Old Testament was most honoring to it, exalted it above all other methods, it would be the most natural thing in the world for Jewish Rabbis to espouse the literal verbal method. The Jews have an unquestioned right to a just pride in the Old Testament Scriptures.

Study these Scriptures in the light of their own plain declarations; study them in comparison with all other sacred writings of the past, and it is plain to see that human thought and speech have not given us anything equal to them in lofty ideals of morality and spiritual uplift. To be the inheritors, guardians, and interpreters of these Scriptures is surely a great responsibility. These Rabbis appreciate this responsibility, and not for anything would they follow a course that would lower the Bible in the estimation of the world. For the past thirty years I have been associated with some of the best educated, most spiritual-minded, hardest-working Rabbis this country has produced, and I do not know one who insists on a literal interpretation of the Old Testament. They say that the first two chapters of Genesis contain an account of religious things, not scientific, a real poem of creation; that the writers were supremely interested in teaching that *God* made all things, and not a demi-god; that the duty of Sabbath observance was more in the mind of the writer than scientific accuracy. Surely if the literal verbal interpretation was

nearer the truth and more honoring to God and the Bible these intelligent Rabbis would teach it.

FIFTH: The word "create" has nothing in it against the doctrine of evolution. Some writers have insisted that the word "create" always means to "make out of hand," "to bring into existence without secondary causes," and "out of nothing." That is not true. The Hebrew word, "bara," means, "to cause to exist," "to bring into being," and the method of bringing into existence is not hinted at. There is absolutely nothing in the word that would indicate method of any kind. Not one ray of comfort can the anti-evolutionists get out of the true meaning of that word "create." Therefore when the Bible says that God created man we have to look outside of that word "create" for his method.

SIXTH: Argument from variations in plants and animals.

An argument in support of evolution which all observant people can appreciate is the fact that animals and plants do vary to some extent at least. We see this with our own eyes.

One of the most interesting experiences people have is the producing of varieties of plants and fruits. This is being done every day by orchardists, florists, and farmers all over the world. The fact is Darwin got his idea of "natural selection" by observing the varieties the farmers were producing by artificial selection. He said nature's method was something like that.

Look at the great variety of hogs, horses, dogs, apples, peaches and other animals and fruits. What wonderful variation from the common stock! This shows a constant tendency to variation.

Again consider the variation in the *rosaceae*. What a wonderful thing it is that the rose, the apple, pear, peach, plum, strawberry, dew-berry and other fruits should all have come from the same common parent. We see in all this what wonderful things variation can accomplish. But most of the varieties I have mentioned were created by man, by artificial selection, in the very short time he has been working at these things. The evolutionists say, give nature the millions of years that geology says she has,

and you can account for all the varieties, all the divisions and subdivisions in the same way, by the constant tendency to vary by the two great laws of heredity and variation.

Consider again the wonderful changes that take place in the development of the frog from its egg. It is hatched out as a tadpole, and has the appearance of a perfect little fish with gills by which it breathes, and a tail with which it swims. It can not live out of water, for it has no lungs with which to breathe. It can not walk on dry land for it has no legs. But note what wonderful changes take place: it forms one pair of legs, and then another pair; then its gills begin to dry up, and its lungs begin to grow, and finally, it breathes entirely by means of its lungs. Then the tail is absorbed, and it is a lung-breathing animal that travels on land by means of its legs.

These wonderful changes millions of people are seeing every year in the warm climates. If nature can produce such marvellous transformations in a few weeks is it unreasonable that still greater changes have taken place during

the countless ages life has been on this planet, and variation has been going on?

Evolutionists do not cite the above example as a demonstration of the origin of species, but it is cited in proof of the wonderful possibilities of variation. Evolutionists have scored a strong point in favor of their claim as to some of the causes of the origin of species when they show what marvellous things have been done, and are still being done right under our own eyes by variation. If plants and animals can vary as much as we see in the life-time of a man or in several generations, why may it not be true that this variation has been going on for many thousands of years, and accounts for all the different forms that dwell on the earth?

Now the contention of the evolutionist is, that species vary without limit; that variation has been going on countless thousands of years, and out of it all have come, by slow processes, the wonderfully interesting and complex forms that we see to-day. As it is no more unreasonable that man should continue to exist hereafter than that he should exist at all, so it is no more unreasonable that plants and animals have

varied for thousands of years than that they vary now right under our own eyes. We should have no difficulty in believing with LeConte that "varieties, species, genera, families, orders, classes etc. are only different degrees of differences formed all in the same way," and are "only different degrees of blood-kinship."

SEVENTH: Argument from Similarity of Structure.

The similarity of bodily structure of man and the higher order of apes is an interesting and instructive one. "Bone for bone, muscle for muscle, ganglion for ganglion, almost nerve-fibre for nerve-fibre man's body corresponds with that of higher animals." (LeConte)

What is the meaning of this similarity of structure, almost identity of structure? Is it not most reasonable to suppose that there is a common origin away back in the remote past?

Here is where some people balk for unreasonable reasons. They readily grant that the rose and pear, peach, plum, and berries all come from a common stem, *rosaceae*, and that the wolf, dog, coyote, and fox came from a common parentage, the *canidae,* but when it is pointed

out that man and the apes belong to the same order of *primates,* they raise their hands in holy horror! Well, however horrible it may be we have to get used to it. But really it is not as horrible as some people pretend. Let us look at the facts fairly and candidly:

In the first place we can not choose our ancestors. We may choose to *believe* that certain beings are or are not our ancestors, but that is a very different proposition. If John Smith, the drunken sot who poisoned his wife in order to marry another woman is your father, you may deny it, you may get red or black in the face if some one reminds you that this John Smith is your father, but your denial does not destroy the fact. John Smith is nevertheless your father. That is as plain as two and two make four. If Captain John Smith, the Governor is *not* your father, your assertion that he is does not make him your father. You may choose to believe, but you can not choose your father. If some anthropoid ape, some hundreds of thousands of years ago was the ancestor of both the human race and of present day monkeys and apes some people may get fighting

mad over the assertion — but that does not change the fact. The whole question is one of evidence. What are the facts?

The same is true with respect to the negro being the remote cousin of the white races. Both the Bible and anthropology teach a common origin of the races. The Bible tells us that Noah was the ancestor of Shem, Ham and Japheth. There is just as much and the same kind of proof from the Bible that Ham is the progenitor of the black races as that Shem and Japheth are the progenitors of the white races. One writer has said recently that there is no "thus saith the Lord" to warrant the assertion that Ham is the progenitor of the negro race. No, there is not; neither is there any "thus saith the Lord" to warrant the assertion that Shem and Japheth are the progenitors of the white races. The argument of a very few people, who can lay no claim to scientific knowledge, that the negro entered the ark as an animal finds no support among educated, fair-minded students of history and science, and it is a great injustice and unkindness to the negro. It is simply foolish for the white man to deny his blood

relationship with the negro. The negro is the white man's far-off cousin. Unfortunately he is sometimes his half-brother.

But why all this resentment of the thought that man shares his primacy with the apes and monkeys? Are all men and women so noble and angelic that we are proud of them all? And are apes so low in the scale of being that we can not bear the idea that some hundreds of thousands of years ago we all had a common ancestor? Let us look these facts squarely in the face:

Man is at once the glory and shame of creation. He can be an angel of light, a saint, a sage, a savior, or he can be a devil incarnate. There is not a devil in hell or out of hell that can do meaner things. Proof: Look at your daily papers the past few weeks. What do we see? A husband poisoning his wife in order to marry another woman; a wife poisoning her husband in order to marry another man; a minister planning the murder of a woman in order to get her property, and helping to commit the murder; a minister murdering his half-brother in order to get his insurance money;

sons in different parts of the country murdering their parents; a woman in one of our large cities lures to her home an innocent young girl telling her that she wanted to be a friend, and wanted to show her some nice clothes. While the girl was trying on some of those nice clothes the woman left the room, and turned her over to a brute man. The man after beating the girl into insensibility assaulted her.

Answer this question at the bar of your soul: Which had you rather be, a child of this man or woman or a descendant of some anthropoid ape? A man or woman who prefers to be descendants of such human brutes or prefers blood relationship with them to our lower kinsfolk, the apes, certainly has nothing to brag about.*

One stimulating thing about this part of the subject is this: a great many thoughtful men are no longer ashamed or afraid to claim kinship with lowlier mammals.

* Note this from the **Commercial Appeal** of Memphis, Tenn. "One morning last week a member of the staff of **The Commercial Appeal**, coming into the city on a street car, heard an old man say this: 'Of all God's creatures, man is the only one endowed with intellect and reason, and yet when I walk out here on the streets at night, man is the only one I am afraid of.' Of course God makes no mistakes, but we wonder if some of the other animals had been endowed with intellect, reason and with a soul, if those animals would make better use of these attributes than man."

Bishop Wilberforce meant an insult when he asked Huxley if he was descended from a monkey on his grand-mother's side or his grand-father's: Huxley made the dignified reply that he would rather be a descendant from an ape than from a man who used his great powers to obscure the truth. Professor Spangler was asked a similar question by Mr. Bryan. His reply is a frank and very instructive résumé of the origin and development of man. He says:

"As to my ancestry, I will 'expose' some of it, not for your benefit, because I think you already know it, but that the public may learn a few of the facts that prove evolution. Also, Mr. Bryan, you should not be so ashamed of your distinguished relatives, the monkeys and the apes, when you must know that you have many lower relatives that even Darwin himself would have been ashamed to claim, such as the skunk, the lizard, the turtle, and venomous snakes.

"I will begin my ancestry by naming the protozoa, from which all other animal life evolved. If you wish to know more about them I refer you to any text-book of zoology. The

Colonial Protozoa come next since they are made up of groups of one-celled animals like my first ancestor. Next are the Matazoa in which there are two kinds of cells, the germ and the somatic cells. I am proud of the Coelenterates because they are composed of two cellular layers surrounding a gastrovascular cavity.

"Others especially honored are the Tonaria-like animals, and other ancestors. These are distinguished because they show the beginning of structures which I possess today, or have had at some stage of my development, such as a skeletal axis (notochord or vertebral column,) paired slits connecting the pharynx with the exterior, and a central nerve-cord dorsal to the alimentary canal.

"I claim the fishes, and reptile-like animals, which lead on through the Chordata to the Monotremata, egg-laying mammals. Also the Insectivora should be mentioned because the Primates evolved from them.

"Among the Primates the Lemur-like animals are distinguished. They have a heavy coating of hair and a tail longer than their legs. Finally, after ages of evolution, appeared Pithecan-

thropus which evolved from animals that also produce the ape. This ape-man has part of the characteristics of man of to-day and part of its ancestors, the latter of which also appear in the ape of today. Specialists on Anthropology and fossils believe that these animals lived about 500,000 years ago.

"From the ape-man developed the Foxhall man followed by the Hiedelburg man that lived 375,000 years ago. The Piltdown man lived 150,000 years ago; the Neanderthal man, 50,000; and the Cro-Magnon man, 25,000. From these arose the Magdalenian people followed by man of to-day.

"That my ancestry is correct is proven by facts established by historical Geology, Paleontology, Embryology, the similarity of structure in existing forms, and precipitation blood tests.

"There is a steady but small increase of brain among the land vertebrates from the amphibia into the egg-laying mammals. The rapid development of mentality comes later when in most stocks of placental mammals there is increasing power of discernment and better

adaptation to the environment. The culmination of the brain in size and complexity of structure begins in the Lemurs, increasing greatly in the ape-man, and reaching its climax in man. In the ape-man, the brain weighed twenty-eight ounces while in man the average weight is forty-nine ounces.

"Thus we see that ascending life grows nobler until it is crowned with Spirit. 'Reason is disclosed in the astounding plan of lower and intermediate life. And a Soul, all truth and Holiness, shines upon our eyes at the peak of life.' 'That is when the brain developed sufficiently so that the animal could discern between right and wrong if given the idea, God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living Soul.'

"Evidently man evolved from a single prehuman species and, as just indicated, must be very old. All the various races must have been very slowly attained. At this point, Mr. Bryan, let me ask you how you account for all the various races of men, if all descended from Adam, as you say, and if climatic and environ-

mental changes do not affect living beings and cause them to change also?

"In the embryological development of man, as well as of other animals, the embryo passes through many of the stages through which man passed in the evolutionary process from the unicellular animal to his present state. As an embryo, I passed through stages that clearly represent the animal mentioned above as my ancestors. At the beginning of my existence, I was a small one-celled animal like a Protozoan. At another stage of development I was a tiny sac-shaped mass, like the Metazoan and Coelenterates, without blood or nerves; at another stage I was a worm-like animal with a pulsating tube instead of a heart and without a head, neck, spinal column or limbs; at another stage, I had as a backbone, a rod of cartilage extending along the back and a faint nerve-cord as in the Amphloxus, one of the lowest of the chordates; at a later stage, I was a fish-like animal with a two chambered heart, mesonephric kidneys, and gill-slits with arteries leading to them, just as in fishes; at another stage, I was a reptile-like animal with a three-

chambered heart, and Cloaca development like other reptiles; at still another stage, I was a Lemur-like animal with a heavy coat of hair and a tail longer than my legs just as in the Lemurs; and finally when I entered upon post-natal sins and actualities, I was a sprawling, squalling, unreasoning quadruped partially fitted for an arboreal existence."

One reason some people are unwilling to claim kinship with lowlier forms of life, or to study arguments bearing on the subject, is because they are snobs, downright snobs. You see them every day. Let a man or woman rise in the world as far as position and money are concerned. See how easily they forget their humbler brothers and sisters, who are poor and may be illiterate. Let a woman get a few dollars ahead, and she will tell you "she never buys anything at the 'five and ten cent store,' and she 'just can't ride on a street car.' " She "cuts" her aunts and uncles and cousins who make less pretensions. Some people will go to almost any length to prove — and they often fail for lack of any foundation — that they are lineal descendants of Governor Brown or

General Smith. The history of the human race is full of such efforts of some people to connect themselves with some illustrious families. The ancients were still more ridiculous. Some of the great men or their friends endeavored to make it appear that they were descended from the gods. Julius Caesar claimed to be a lineal descendent of Venus. Snobbery, downright snobbery! Let us cease to be snobs, and consider calmly and intelligently the arguments in support of the facts that touch upon our descent from the humbler forms of life such as the protozoan, marsupials, and apes. This does not mean that God had nothing to do with our origin. God made the protozoan and other animals just as truly as he made man.

Let us consider another side of the subject that ought to dispel our prejudice against evolution. I have just shown that one has not said necessarily a very inspiring thing when he says he is descended from man, for it is plain that some men and women — vastly too many — are worse than the common brute. Let us consider the ape — our primordial kins-people,

and see if they are after all so very low and unworthy.

The apes come nearer keeping the laws which God has stamped on their being than man does — or rather than some do. Proof: An ape will steal food, but when he has food he will not murder nor rob widows and orphans to get it — some men do. Apes will fight to the death for their lives, for their offspring and for their mates, but they commit no murder, and they do not kill in revenge.

Dr. Bernard Hollander, a London scientist, as reported by *The New York Herald* and the *Commercial Appeal* of Memphis, has this fine word for our far-away cousins:

"We have much to learn from the lower orders of nature about perfect monogamy. Among anthropoid apes, for example, you have an almost perfect instance of single attachment between male and female. The mother love of the ape is unparalleled in the animal world and scarcely equalled by mankind.

"We need restoration of the plain old-fashioned sense of loyalty. Loyalty which makes men stand by each other in peril should

make men stand by their chosen partner in the battle of life. It is all a constant war between intemperance and control. The war has created an artificial sense of independence among women, but it is the national home life environment that will prevail over what I believe is a passing phase."

If any apology is due to any one because of man's kinship with apes apologize to the apes! If they could speak they might say they would rather be the humble ape obeying the laws God has stamped on their being than to be the human brutes I have described above.

One of the awful things about man's fall into infamous crimes is this: When he falls he falls not to the level of the brute, but below it. Take, for instance, the case cited above where a woman, under the pretense of friendship, lured a young, innocent working girl to her home, and then turned her over to the beastly assault of a man. No common brute ever did anything as mean as that.

A writer in one of our papers in trying to evade the force of the above argument, and to excuse or palliate the crime, says the "Devil

is too busy tempting man to fool with monkeys." But you can not explain man's crimes on the score that the devil tempted him. You can not get anywhere with that argument. If the devil is to blame why do the courts punish men? This plea that the devil tempts men will do you no good whatsoever in a court of law. Try it and see. Go into a court of law and tell the Judge and jury that the devil tempted you to steal the automobile, or to murder, or to run away with another man's wife. See what the Judge and jury will say to that plea. Nor will you find any comfort in the Bible. Adam and Eve could not escape. Look the passages up carefully, and you will find that the firmest, plainest teaching is that God judges man "according to the deeds done in the body," that "man suffers for his own sins."

The truth, the awful truth, is that man is shamed by the beast of the field. When he commits some heinous crime he falls below the brute. This being true we should not be prejudiced against the teachings of biology which show resemblances of the child before birth and after to apes and other lower animal forms

from which it is claimed man has descended. That brings us to consider the eighth argument:

EIGHTH: Resemblances between parent and child —

Similarity in development of human Embyro and lower Forms.

Resemblance between parents and their children has been noticed and commented on perhaps by parents and friends ever since the intelligence of parents enabled them to see resemblances. All over the world to-day and as far back as we have had a history this subject is a constant theme of parents and friends. How many millions of times is it being said daily all over the world: "why, that boy is just like his father;" or, "the girl is just like her mother," or, "it has its mother's nose and mouth, its father's eyes and hair."

In spite of individuality which belongs to every one how very striking are the resemblances between parents and their children. Sometimes resemblances skip for two or three generations. Sometimes parents and friends can not account for the features of some of their children, because the parents have never seen

or have forgotten the features of their own parents and grand-parents. But suppose some neighbor has known intimately the child's grand-parents and great-grand-parents. When the neighbor sees the child he sees resemblances not to the father or mother, but to some grand-parent, or to some aunt or uncle. This also is a common occurrence. Sometimes parents are indebted to their neighbors for having known their children's grand-parents, and collateral kin, and are able to point out resemblances. We see all this resemblance, however, after the child is born and has grown up; and we all admit that we see very little resemblance to the ape and the ancient marsupials, our far-away kin. But we do see a little. If you want to make an original scientific observation here is your opportunity: The next time you are in the presence of a week-old babe take hold of its hand with one of your fingers. You will find you can lift it up completely above its crib, and it will remain suspended from ten seconds to one or two minutes before turning loose. But after six weeks, although it may not have gained more than a pound in weight — maybe not that — it can not

remain suspended at all. Why this remarkable phenomenon? Scientists tell us that the babe's ability to sustain its weight is an inheritance from its aboreal ancestors. Our ancestors swung from tree to tree in mirthful glee or in fear of the enemy for thousands and thousands of years, and they acquired a very great prehensible ability, and this ability crops out as an inheritance in the new-born babe. Let the babe get its fingers in your hair or whiskers and see what happens! Yet the baby's muscles are flabby and untrained. Its strength is an inheritance from its ape ancestry. When the child becomes a man you will see two teeth, one on each side of the incisors, called by all dentists and scientists "dog-teeth" or "canine teeth." Why? Because they are very much like the two teeth in dogs similarly situated.

Did you ever see an angry dog or an angry man snarl? There is a decided similarity between the two. Both show their sharp, canine teeth.

Unless a woman has been trained to fight with her fists she fights naturally and instinctively with the palm side of her wrist, and in this way

she can give a very good account of herself. She gets this from her Chimpanzee ancestors. The Chimpanzee is without doubt the greatest wrist fighter in the world. There is no animal his size and no man five or ten times his size that can conquer him with bare hands. Some years ago the *Geographical Magazine* published an article by an explorer in Africa setting forth the powers of the Chimpanzee. His story in brief was this: while he and the African chief were away from the chief's hut where the explorer was staying, the chief's young son heard a noise out in the bushes, and taking the explorer's gun went out, saw a chimpanzee, and shot at him wounding him slightly. Then the negro boy threw the gun down, and ran back to the hut. When the explorer and the chief returned the boy told them what had happened. The chief said he would take a club and a big knife and finish the wounded chimpanzee. He went out, found the chimpanzee, and they engaged in a fierce fight. Although the chief was over six feet tall and a perfect specimen of physical manhood, and in spite of the fact that the chimpanzee was wounded, in less than ten minutes,

before help could come, he had killed the chief, beating him literally into a pulp with the palm side of his wrists. Women may not admire the chimpanzee because of his lack of dignity in traveling too much on all-fours, and for some other evidences of imperfection, judged from the human standpoint; nevertheless, we can not withhold our admiration for the chimpanzee's courage and physical prowess. Furthermore, there ought to be an unbroken bond of sympathy between mothers and the chimpanzee: first, because the woman can put up a very worthy defense with her wrist as the chimpanzee does, and, second, because a woman's offspring gets about on its all-fours for months in unconscious imitation of its primordial forbears.

Some people seriously object to our kinship with the anthropoid apes because the tails of some of them are very obvious. How unscientific and unreasonable is that objection! While the tail of man is not obvious, *it is nevertheless there.* If you doubt this, get a competent surgeon to cut through the skin in the lower part of your backbone: there you will see a rudi-

mentary tail with muscles to work it. Professor Henry Drummond says this is the "scaffolding" left in Man to show his descent from lower forms. "The organs of a chimpanzee are almost identical with those of a man, and the blood of one can hardly be distinguished from that of the other."

As further proof of descent from lower forms let us consider the development of the human embryo from its microscopic germ cell. I once read a paper on evolution before a ministers' Association, and the following remarkable statement was elicited: One minister said he had always thought that the human embryo began its existence with microscopic legs, lungs, hands, bones, nervous system and all, and that the only thing necessary was for it to grow!

It would not be surprising if half the people thought that way to-day.

Every student of biology knows that is not the case. The embryo begins as a microscopic germ cell almost entirely homogeneous in structure. There is no suspicion of bones, muscles, nerves — no outlines whatever of a human being. The first change that takes place is the

multiplication of the cells; then there is a division into three layers of cells, and out of these comes the back-bone, nervous system, blood system, by a wonderful process of differentiation and growth. The most important thing to note in the process of the embryo from cell to the maturity of the embryo is that in certain stages of the embryo's development it shows gill-slits like the fish. Sometimes the marks or the scars of the gill-slits are seen on the neck of the child after birth, and remain there through life. The embryo has no need whatsoever of the gill-slits, as it is a lung-breathing animal. The scientists' belief is that man on his upward progress to become Man passed through the fish stage, hence this relic of gill-slits. Is not this a reasonable explanation? In one stage of its development the tail of the human embryo is longer than its body. Does all this mean nothing? Does it not mean kinship in the remote past? Note this statement of a recent scientist quoted from the *Outlook:*

"It is absolutely certain that every reader of this article physically passed through some

animal forms in the mother's womb before birth. The creation of the body was in every one of us a process of evolution. George John Romanes in *Darwin and After Darwin* makes this perfectly clear:

"Like that of all other organisms, unicellular or multicellular, his (man's) development starts from the nucleus of a single cell . . . . When his animality becomes established, he exhibits the fundamental anatomical qualities which characterize such lowly animals as polypus and jelly-fish, and even when he is marked off as the vertebrate it can not be said whether he is to be a fish, a reptile, a bird, or a beast. Later on it becomes evident that he is to be a mammal; but not till later can it be said to which order of mammals he belongs.

"Romanes enforces this statement by printing illustrations of the various forms which it is known man passes through before birth. Printed side by side, they show embryos of a fish, a salamander, a tortoise, a bird, a hog, a calf, a rabbit, and a man in three successive stages of development, and in them, as Romanes truly says, 'there is very little difference

between the eight animals at the earliest of the three stages represented, all having fish-like tails, gill-slits, and so on.' "

The tail of the human embryo becomes gradually absorbed, and all that remains of the tail in the mature skeleton is the coccyx, three to five vertebrae. And strange to say the rudimentary muscles are still there which formerly moved the tail. These are some of the resemblances between man and the lower forms before and after birth which suggest relationship in a far-off time, which argue the fact that man and these lower forms had a common ancestry. These facts constitute one of the strongest arguments in favor of evolution. One of the surest facts in biology is that like begets like. When we see so many resemblances we say there must have been a blood relationship.

Another remarkable fact in biology is that unlike begets unlike. The protozoan is the first and simplest form of animal life. It propagates its kind by simple division. The cells are entirely separate. Sometimes the divided cells cling together. Not much difference, but a difference, unlikeness.

In the metazoans, a species of the protozoan, the structure is a little more complex. There are structural units within the metazoans that perform separate functions. One set of cells serve as stimuli, other cells perform other functions. There is therefore greater unlikeness between the metazoans and the one-cell protozoan. In other species of protozoa there is still further complexity; some are naked; some have shells. The complexity increases as you ascend from the protozoan. When you look at the protozoan you would hardly imagine that it was the progenitor of these more complex forms, so great is the unlikeness. But in the study of Botany and Biology we come across the most astonishing examples of unlikeness where there is a real descent. Take for instance the relationship between strawberry, raspberry, pear, peach, apple, rose — all descendants of a rose-bush ancestor — we could scarcely imagine that they had the same common ancestry. Same is true of fishes and birds. In other words we can not judge from the finished product what the beginning was. Unlikeness should not hinder our belief.

In this connection let us consider the beginning of the human embryo. If it were not for the careful scientific research which has placed all the facts before us we would never suppose that the tiny microscopic germ-cell was the mother and father of the new-born babe, and, later on, of the full-grown man. What a difference, what unlikeness, between the simple one-cell protoplasm and the fullgrown man!

NINTH: Arguments from Rocks.

Another argument in favor of evolution that I shall consider is the argument from the rocks. The facts are these: Scientists said if evolution is true the higher forms of life have come out of lower forms by gradual transformation — "descent with modifications," and that if we had any trustworthy record of the succession of life on the globe it would show this fact. A study of the stratified rocks showed just what the evolutionists predicted it would show. Rocks where life has been found were formed by the gradual wearing down of hills, mountains, and the vegetation that grew there, and were deposited at the bottom of seas, lakes, and rivers. The lowest rocks were the first that

were formed. This gradual formation went on for ages. By and by there was an upheaval. Due to some great convulsion of the earth this first layer of rock came to the surface. Upon this rock was deposited earth, and upon it grew grass, weeds, and various forms of animal life. And there came a subsidence, due also to earthquake or some other kind of convulsion of the earth, and this first layer of rock with all the life that was on it went down to the bottom of the sea. Again the current began to do the work it had done before: the water washed down from the hills and mountains, gravel, sand, etc., and covered up the weeds and animals, and their skeletons lie there to-day to tell the tale. They have been preserved, just as the inhabitants of Pompeii were preserved for nearly two thousand years, before excavations unearthed the City, and showed the life of that day in most wonderful detail.

And this is not the end of the story; a second layer of rock was formed covering up completely the first forms of vegetable and animal life. Again there was an upheaval: again there was grown vegetation and animal life,

and again there was a subsidence. These upheavals, growth of vegetal and animal forms, and subsidence followed each other at irregular intervals of time, and are going on at the present day.

What the geologists found, *and are still finding today,* is this: in the very oldest rocks there is no evidence of animal life, but simple vegetable forms. This, they say, is proof that plants came first. Then in the next stratum they find animal life in its simplest forms. In still higher strata there are higher forms of animal life. There is found everywhere a succession of higher forms following lower. This is strong proof that the higher forms were evolved out of the lower by descent with modifications. When other facts are taken into consideration, finding all the connecting links of the horse, it is looked upon as a demonstration. The records of the rocks are fragmentary, not all the facts of life have been recorded or preserved. This is what might be expected. This imperfect record is due to erosions which in some instances have destroyed the record, to change of climate, to migrations and other causes. If the record was

complete, no breaks in it, there would be a complete history of the succession of forms from the lowest to the highest life. Even as it is evolutionists have been able to trace the life history of some forms completely, showing their development from very low, imperfect forms to their present state of perfection. This is true of the horse and Planorbis.

Professor Marsh, an American of whom we all should be proud, after years of painstaking labor, showed the development of the horse from a three-toed ancestor about the size of the fox on and up through various ancestors to the one-toed horse as we find him to-day. This record is complete. The side-splints which we find in horses to-day are evidences of the three-toed ancestor. The Planorbis has been studied by Professors Hilgendorf and Hylatt with remarkable results. The Planorbis consists of various fresh-water, air-breathing mollusks found in stratified rocks near Steinheim, Germany. "In passing from the lowest to the highest strata the species change greatly and many times, the extreme forms being so different that, were it not for the intermediate forms

they would be called not only different species but different genera. And yet the gradations are so insensible (so gradual) that the whole series is nothing less than a demonstration, in this case at least, of origin of species by derivation with modifications." (LeConte in *Evolution and Religion,* page 236-7).

There also have been found in the rocks records of other animal forms more or less complete until there came a break in the rocks. The work of investigation among the rocks is still going on, conducted by governments and by some of the leading universities. All the facts that are being obtained tend to show greater completeness, and throws more light on the contentions of evolutionists that succession in geologic times means derivation of one form from another.

TENTH: There are many arguments in favor of evolution. When you put them all together, a little here, a little there, it is a most convincing array of facts in support of its truth. I shall mention only one other argument, the one from rudimentary and useless organs.

Biologists find in the horse, splint bones which

mark his descent from a three-toed ancestor. The splint bones are useless, but they remain to tell the tale of its former ancestry. If made by special creation, made by hand, would they have been put there? The appendix in man was once a useful organ in some remote ancestor. If man was made by special creation would it have been left in man? "The baleen whales have no teeth, and no use for them. Yet the embryo of the whale has a full set of rudimentary teeth deeply buried in the jawbone, and formed in the usual way characteristic of mammalian teeth, *but the teeth are never cut.*"

Teeth were useful to some of the ancestors of the whale, but their changed manner of living made them useless, and they became absorbed. If the baleen whale had been made by special creation do you think the rudimentary teeth which were never cut, would have been made, and deeply buried in the jawbone? Why should there be a tail in the human embryo? The tail is not needed by the embryo. Can there be any better reason than that it was once a very real and necessary organ of our remote ancestors, and has come down as an inheritance?

These are some of the evidences of the truth of evolution briefly stated. Evolutionists have brought together a great number of facts to support their position. These facts should be faced fairly, and we should consider the subject in the light of sober, intelligent judgment.

The anti-evolutionist imagines he has made a very weighty objection to evolution when he asks whether any one has ever seen one species change into another species?

Species are not made that rapidly. It is too much to expect a wolf to change into a pointer dog "while you wait." No evolutionist has ever taught that species are made in the life time of any one man. So it is very evident that no one ever saw one species change into another. What people have seen and are seeing is variation, change, such great unlikeness between the different varieties of dogs, for instance, that as LeConte says, if they were found in a state of nature the extreme varieties would be called different species.

Another fact must be considered: "Natural Selection" works very slowly. It takes many thousands of years for the accumulation of

differences that result in species. But what man has not seen with his own eyes geology has enabled him to see as he studies the development of life in the pages of stratified rocks. There he sees the evidences of the offspring of one species of birds changing gradually into another species. In some instances all or most all the missing links have been found. The same is true of the horse and plenorbis. Here is evidence that satisfies millions of students of science that some birds and the horse, and the plenorbis have come to their present state of development by gradual changes from the lower to the higher, from one species into another species. Evolutionists are not slow to admit that species are now more permanent than in the past. Ages and ages ago conditions were such that species were more plastic, and therefore there were greater changes. The older the species and the more specialized the less liable to change.

But has any one ever seen God make man and other animals "with his hands and fingers" or "with the word of his mouth?" Did any man since man has been on the earth see the

work done, and then testify to it? If the first account of creation in the first chapter of Genesis is true, Adam was made last, and therefore, had no opportunity of seeing the creation of plants and the other animals. If the second account is true Adam did have the opportunity of seeing the creation, because he was made before the plants and animals, but never for once did he say he saw God make things with his hands and fingers or any other way.

That idea that God made everything "perfect" has no warrant in any plain declaration of Scripture nor is it a reasonable deduction from the facts of Scriptures. Search the Scriptures, and see if you can find anywhere a statement that He made everything perfect. In the account of creation God is referred to as having said that the things He made were "very good." Ezekiel declares that God made man "upright;" but nowhere in the Bible does God or any one else say that man or other creatures were made perfect.

If Adam was made perfect he was about as sorry a specimen of perfection as the eyes of man ever looked upon. We have some patience

and respect for the man who when starving will eat fruit he is commanded not to eat in order to live. But this "perfect" man Adam was put into the garden of Eden surrounded with everything that pleased the eye or could satisfy hunger. Not because he was starving, but for curiosity or some other reason he took of the forbidden fruit, and according to a certain type of theology, brought death and damnation to three-fourths of the human race. This "perfect" man fell before the first temptation that came in his path, and it was not a temptation that was born of hunger and want.

Man is not perfect to this day. There is nothing perfect on earth. Everything is in a state of progressive change. The astronomers tell us that there still remain immeasurable realms of starry mist where worlds are being evolved, and may be new plants and animals are being formed.

If there is anything perfect on earth, what is it? It surely is not man. Look at the race riots, and such murders as we have at Meherrin, Illinois. No, it is surely not man. It can not be our industrial system which for forty years

or more has had strikes and lock-outs which have cost the country thousands of lives annually, a very great destruction of property, and much suffering on account of high prices? And such hatreds!

The only hope for the human race is the tireless working of the ever-patient God through man and in the laws of nature, and the outstretching of man's hand and heart, and soul, and mind in his effort to help God make strong and safe the world.

CHAPTER VII

EVOLUTION AND REVELATION

ANTI-EVOLUTIONISTS bring awful charges against those who believe in evolution. They say the evolutionists do not believe in the Bible nor prayer, nor in revelation. These are very serious delinquencies, if true. They are not true. These charges are cruel, unjust, and unwarrantable. Let us consider what is the attitude of evolution toward revelation.

Revelation is really a complement of Evolution. Evolution deals with secondary causes. Evolutionists say that changes in organic life are made by the laws of nature, by orderly processes, by forces that reside in the organism. They also say as plainly as words can make it that there is "no justification for the materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter force, and necessity." That is to say, we can not account for this

wonderful world with its beauty and goodness and order and progress from lower to higher on the supposition that it was made by materialistic forces, devoid of mind and purpose. As shown in another chapter, Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, LeConte, Fisk, Conklin, Spangler and a host of others have made it as plain as language can make it that Atheism is no explanation of the existence of worlds and life. Why not take these men at their word?

If then it is true that materialism and atheism are not an explanation of the origin of things, no one can deny the right of the philosopher and theologian to affirm spirit, mind, God as the true explanation. The Theologian sees God working in two ways, as the Immanent God, the God of Science, and as the Transcendent God, the God ever near his children in time of need — the God who answers prayer.

The Immanent God works in a masterly, rather autocratic way, yet it is best. The laws of nature know no favorites. The sun rises on the good and bad alike, and so do the rains descend. Accidental poison will kill the good man as certainly as it will the bad. I have seen

good crops come to the man who swore and was not thankful, just exactly as they came to the minister, his good neighbor. The seasons come with their heat and cold, sunstrokes and freezing, life and death, with an exactness that is marvelous. This is the work of the Immanent God. Man is affected by the laws of this Immanent God: he can not escape them. In many essential respects that which happens to him happens also to the brute creation.

But Evolution points out with unmistakable clearness that man is something more than an animal. He has something that the lower animal has not. Man has consciousness; he is capable of abstract thought; his highest ideals are spiritual; he is the only thing in creation of which we can affirm spiritual kinship with the great Over-Soul through whom all things have come. In other words, man is a child of God. As such God deals with him somewhat as an earthly father deals with his children, by moral suasion, by contact with his soul. Let me illustrate this thought by means of a comparison: God is the great Macrocosm. He is the Soul and Power behind all universal laws. Man is

a microcosm. He too has a little world of his own. In his world he too does and must do somethings arbitrarily, not necessarily, however, contrary to reason: not necessarily like a tyrant. But in his little world the time often comes when he and he alone must decide what is to be done. If he has a ten acre field that he thinks best to plant in corn — corn is planted. He does not consult the field nor any human being as to whether he shall plant it in corn. The responsibility is his, and he decides. He thinks that some forest trees should be cut into wood or lumber, and so it is. He does not ask his mules whether they should work five days in a week or six, or whether they should pull the plow or pull the wagon. To some extent man is a microcosm, he is the lord of a little realm.

But note the difference in man's conduct when he comes to his children. The sane father does not deal with children in the same way he deals with his horse, his trees, his land. He deals with them upon a very different, a much higher plane. They are his children, the father's immortal mind is stamped on them. He deals with them in a way to reach their minds, their

souls. His method from beginning to end is principally education, reason, persuasion. Before the child can talk there is placed before him blocks with the A. B. C.'s; blocks with 1, 2, 3, pictures of horses, cows, houses etc. By the time he can talk he knows his letters, his figures, the names of different objects, and soon afterwards he learns to read. Then the parents take up the question of schools; then they begin to talk to the child face to face about the great problems of life, life's glory, its shame, the pitfalls of life. They talk to him about honor. honesty, industry, unselfishness. In all of this they seek to reach the soul of the child, and they are endeavoring to awaken and nourish the same lofty ideals that sway their own souls. It is a work of moral suasion. They are saying to their children what God is saying to all of us: "Come, let us reason together."

God can not reach the best in man by the play of inexorable natural laws upon his being. He must talk to man face to face, soul to soul, *and that is revelation.*

While the prophets of the Old Testament were at times a bit too realistic, too anthropomor-

phic, yet they told an essential, an abiding truth when they said man talked face to face with God. Now the forces of evolution have been transferred from the physical to the moral and spiritual plane. Man was helped by the inexorable natural laws of the Immanent God, now if he is to rise to the full stature of his spiritual manhood he must have the help of the Transcendent God, his heavenly Father. God gives him wisdom and strength, *and that is revelation.*

"Speak to him thou, for he hears, and spirit with spirit can meet,
Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

The spiritual powers of God come in touch with the aspiring soul of man in answer to man's deepest longing, and man is uplifted. This is revelation. When in the deep of his soul man realizes his absolute need of God — need of His wisdom and strength to help him live the moral and spiritual life more completely, and cries to God for help, God comes into his soul, and man is helped — this is revela-

tion. Man reaches the greatest heights of his experience when he can say, "Without Thee, nothing is strong, nothing is holy."

"In finding Thee are all things round us found,
In losing Thee are all things lost besides."

This is a glorious truth, and there is a scientific basis for it. No words are nobler than the ones of Herman Lotze which friends placed upon his tombstone:

"Love for the living God and longing to be approved by Him is the scientific as it is the Christian basis of morality; and science can not find a firmer basis nor life a surer."

It is a very great and grievous mistake to say that evolution has a tendency to destroy our belief in revelation. Evolution makes way for it; lays the foundation. If man is something more than an animal, if he is truly a spiritual being, and needs the help of a spiritual God, his Father, revelation is a *necessity*. Revelation is just as natural and necessary in the spiritual sphere as natural laws are natural and necessary in the realm of nature. It is the same God working in different ways.

CHAPTER VIII

WHAT SHOULD BE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD EVOLUTION?

I SEE no good reason whatever for antagonism. The rank and file of evolutionists the past hundred years have not only left ample room for the philosophers and theologians to affirm faith in the presence and power of God behind laws, but they have said *over and over again* that a materialistic or atheistic interpretation of the universe is unthinkable. They have never taught that natural laws operate themselves. Chance and mind are the only things they have to choose between, and they have chosen mind as the explanation.

There is no such thing as the operation of laws apart from mind. No statute law, no matter how perfect, operates itself. If it is enforced it is because of living, active men and women behind it. For the same reason nowhere else in this universe is law self-operative. Behind

it must be mind and will. If a few scientists — one or two of note in each generation the past hundred years — have taken a different view surely the testimony of a few men should not outweigh the plain and forceful teachings of the thousands. Furthermore, the few atheistic scientists who say that chance is the explanation of the universe have more credulity than those who say, mind and will.

The evolutionist finds many things in biology which he can not explain; but it is very permissable for him to say in explanation, somehow, God.

How did the first cell come into existence? As a *scientist* he must say, from a scientific standpoint, I can not tell; but he does not stultify his intelligence when he adds, somehow, God.

How does the cell grow? How does the living cell take up dead matter and transform it into life? Science has no complete answer. Matter and energy play a part. The philosopher and theologian have a right to say, somehow, God.

When a cell reaches a certain maximum size, and fission sets in to divide it, what is it that

determines the standard maximum size? Can we not truly say, somehow, God?

The same is true of resident forces. The human embryo develops from a microscopic germ cell by means of forces that reside in the cell. But is it possible for us to believe that so wonderful a thing can happen without some kind of supervision from intelligence? The attitude towards evolution of an increasingly large number of people is one of thorough-going acceptance. They are not brow-beaten away from the belief by the lecturer who puts most of his energy into ridicule, and endeavors with all his skill to raise a laugh about our progenitors that "once had tails, and skipped about from tree to tree." People are facing squarely the facts that tend to show that man has ascended from the brute. The thing of chiefest concern with us should be, not to act like a brute *now,* and worse than a brute. There is no need for a man to be ashamed of his origin from lower forms; but he ought to be ashamed for acting worse than a brute *now.* No fair-minded man can deny that thousands of men and women act worse than brutes now. Some

people seem to think it a most horrid thing ever to have had in the remote past an ancestor that had a tail. But is it any more horrid than the real living fact known to all students of biology that the human embryo of every child born into the world had at one stage of its development a tail longer than its body? Is it any more horrid that our remote ancestors were closely related to apes than the fact that can not be successfully disputed that the human embryo at one stage of its development looks so much like the embryo of the ape that you can not tell which is ape and which is man?

Face these facts fairly, and get over the idea of "horrid."

There is another attitude toward evolution which is a worthy one. That is, one can disbelieve in evolution, and at the same time believe that it *may* be true, that it may be God's way of doing things. In other words, while you do not accept the theory you are willing for your neighbor to believe it, and you do not call him atheist, materialist, and a perverter of morals and religion. We meet that kind of good people daily.

Mr. Bryan has admirably described this attitude in his article in the June, 1922, number of the *Homiletic Review*. On page 446 he says: "It is not contended that God could not employ evolution as a method. * * * He could make man by 'the long drawn out process called evolution' just as easily as He could make man by separate act, as recorded in the Bible."

That is a reasonable and unobjectionable attitude. If God could make man by "the long drawn out process called evolution" then surely evolutionists who believe this was God's method are not atheists, perverters of man's morals and religion. They may be mistaken in their theory, but there are no just grounds whatever for saying they are atheists, etc., Mr. Bryan, himself, being judge.

But unfortunately Mr. Bryan did not stick to his text. He forgets this broad, charitable statement, and before he closes his article he has nothing but scathing denunciation for all who teach evolution, and he denies evolution as a possibility. In the same article, page 449, he says: "It would not be worth while to disturb the wild flights of the evolutionists if belief

in Darwinism did not disturb the philosophy of life. But the evolutionist meddles with vital things. He poisons both religion and civilization."

In the same article, page 451, Mr. Bryan says: "The objection to evolution, therefore, is that, with nothing to support it, it assails all that is sacred in human life. It undermines faith in God, etc." That statement is not true, and in his sober judgment Mr. Bryan knows it is not true. It is the wildest "guess" that has been made in this entire discussion. It is not true that "evolution has nothing to support it"; it is not true that the people who believe it and teach it "assail all that is sacred in human life." The moral and religious values of evolution must be judged by the interpretation which intelligent writers, speakers and ministers who believe it put upon it. Hundreds of religious papers, magazines, ministers, professors in colleges and universities, put no such disparaging interpretation upon it. They believe in evolution, and their preaching and their writings are a constant appeal to the moral life, to all that is divinest in man. To

affirm directly or by implication as some anti-evolutionists are doing, that such men as Ex-president Eliot of Harvard, President Lowell of Harvard, Faunce of Brown, Angell and Conklin of Princeton, Butler of Columbia, Neeham of Cornell, Dr. Abbott of the Outlook, Dr. Vedder of Crozer, and a whole host of teachers and ministers are too ignorant to know the bearings of their teaching on the moral life of the people or are too vicious to care is inexcusable effrontery.

Why can not anti-evolutionists be as reasonable and as fair in their attitude toward evolutionists as astronomers and scientists were toward anti-gravitationists and all those who bitterly opposed the doctrines of the sphericity of the earth and the helio-centric doctrine of our universe?

These opposers of Science were clearly in the wrong, no mistake about that — but the scientists did not call them atheists, nor did they charge them with undermining religion and morality. There is no more justification in calling evolutionists atheists than there would have been if the scientists had called the opponents

of Galileo, Copernicus, Newton and others by such opprobrious names.

Admit as Mr. Bryan has done that evolution may be the "long drawn out process" by which God has made the universe, and it is plain to see that the charge of atheism has not a scintilla of justification in logic, science, or philosophy, or common sense. A few evolutionists have spoken irreverently and very foolishly about prayer and about God; but what of it? Is it not a fact that every great truth has been more or less injured by its friends? With some people is not the priceless gem of liberty but another name for licentiousness or looseness? Is not democracy sometimes interpreted in terms of anarchy? Yes, and we need not be surprised if some people see in evolution no God and no need of prayer.

But do we allow the great doctrine of liberty to stand or fall with the teachings of the licentious? Do we lose faith in democracy because some anarchists parade under that name? Let us be honest and fair.

"Natural selection" and "Survival of the

Fittest" are phases of evolution that have been misjudged by the opponents of evolution.

Evolution does not stand or fall with Darwin's theory of "Natural Selection." There are many who are thorough-going evolutionists who do not accept this phase of Darwin's doctrine. Sometimes a scientist will state from a public platform his disbelief in "Natural Selection," and it is amusing to see how some newspaper reporters herald the astounding news that this scientist no longer believes in evolution, and predicts that evolution is on its last legs! The fact is that a number of scientists from the beginning never believed in the theory of "Natural Selection," but nevertheless they are thorough-going believers in evolution.

Whatever may be the merits or demerits of "Natural Selection," one thing it does not mean: it does not mean that the laws of nature operate themselves. We know nothing of any kind of law that operates itself. Law is method. Behind all law is power. The vast majority of scientists teach that behind all world phenomena is Spiritual Power.

The doctrine of "Survival of the Fittest" in

the sense that Darwin used the term is as true as any axiom in logic or mathematics. The "horror" of the doctrine is simply the perversions of those who are too prejudiced to understand it. The "Survival of the Fittest" means that those forms will survive which are in best keeping with their environment, without any discussion of their *moral* qualities. If the climate changes, as the climate has changed from time to time from warmer to colder, the animals that had most hair and most warmth survived, while those that had no hair and least warmth would perish. Could it be otherwise?

In a country invaded by enemies those forms would live that could hide in rocks or keep out of the way of the enemy in some other way, or could kill the enemy, and those that could not would perish. This is the "Survival of the Fittest." They are in better keeping with their environment. Even in the world of man, in the economic realm, this law sometimes holds sway. I saw its sad workings in the panic of 1893. The man who had *money* enough to tide over the hard times survived, the man who had nothing but property and debts went to the wall. It

was not a question of moral fitness, but of financial fitness. Sometimes the man of honor went down while his unscrupulous partner survived. These are undeniable facts, "hawk at it, and tear it" as you please.

But in the realm of man the law of "Survival of the Fittest" is not as ruthless as it is elsewhere. For more than two thousand years the best men have been preaching that the moral man, the spiritual man should survive; that he is the fittest. We find the dawning of that idea in Old Testament Scriptures. Israel was in need of a leader to direct them in their conflicts with the Philistines. Samuel was commanded to annoint Saul King. The writer in I Samuel 9:2 said that Saul was "a choice young man:—from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people." Physical qualifications, brawn, and cunning, were the chief considerations. This was true of all nations at that time. But we find the beginning of a new and better idea in I Samuel, 16:17, when there is to be the selection of another king. Eliab, one of Jesse's sons is brought before Samuel and Samuel thought because of his stature that

surely he was the right one: "But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the Lord seeth not as man seeth: for man looketh on the outward appearance but the Lord looketh on the heart." More and more that idea has been growing, and today we believe that the man of peace and good-will, the man of honor, character, unselfishness, the man of good, sound body, is the kind of man that should survive and people the earth with offspring. This is the kind of men and women civilization is trying to produce today. Therefore when some of the German people interpreted the doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest" in terms of height of stature, perfection of physical manhood, intellectual astuteness and moral ruthlessness, they were harking back to the idea of things in the time of Saul, forgetful of the fact that God and the people repudiated that idea as noted in the sixteenth chapter of I Samuel.

If these Germans appealed to Darwin's doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest" to justify them in their perverted idea of things, my

reply is, they simply misinterpreted, distorted the true, modern meaning of the doctrine.

The doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest" can not be thrown aside because some people have perverted it. Rightly interpreted it is a friend and not an enemy of the human race. The ideal man is one who has a sound body, a sound mind, and a good heart. The sound body can not be neglected nor ignored. Our preaching and our practice are in the line of perfecting the body, giving it health and vitality. And we are seeking to eliminate the physically unfit. Just how far we should go in this in all cases it is impossible to decide. But the difficulties surrounding the subject are not going to make the people sit idly by, and do nothing. We are seeking to eliminate some of the unfit — some who seem incurably vicious in body and mind and morals — by sterilization.

A goodly number of ministers have made it a rule not to perform the marriage ceremony for people who have or have had some communicable disease that can give to innocent babes some of the worst disorders that afflict mankind. This is one way they are trying to

make the fittest survive. Love and religion do not dictate a policy of non-interference or indifference where the bodies and the souls of men are at stake. The incurably unfit should not be allowed to people the earth with their kind. Men of strong bodies, and minds, and souls is the ideal of a sane love and religion. Give to the doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest" the interpretation that the facts warrant, and it will be seen to be a friend and helper of the human race. Kindness, and love, and the "golden rule" are not inconsistent with the doctrine of the "Survival of the Fittest."

Let it be said once more that evolution does not teach that natural laws are self-operative. The development of the mother and father out of whom have come love for the child, the development of the child's moral nature, love of home and the foundation of our civilization was not an "accident" of evolution. Behind the operation of these laws was Power, Life, God.

CHAPTER IX

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE OF EVOLUTION AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

THE outlook for what evolutionists believe to be a more rational interpretation of natural laws, a truer view of the Bible, and a saner attitude toward the freedom of our schools and colleges is very hopeful. The search for truth is not going to be impeded by adverse legislation. Legislatures have the power to regulate the course of studies in all public schools, but they are going to use this power with discretion. Academic freedom is a part of our national inheritance. It is as sacred as the freedom of the press, and thoughtful men are not going to throw it away because of the prejudice of some people.

If scientists teach false doctrines they must be refuted by scientists in the class-rooms of our high schools and universities and in the laboratories — not in the halls of legislatures

by men who have not made any special study of the subject. Never in the history of education do we find that the scientists have been set right by the minister or laymen. Whatever errors scientists have made they were corrected by scientists. Scientists should be judged by their peers, not by those who have made no special study of the subject.

The Kentucky Legislature refused to give its sanction to the bill to prohibit the free discussion of scientific questions in its public schools. To be sure the vote was close — only one majority for academic freedom; but in all probability if the question should come up in that state again or in any other state the vote would be larger for academic freedom. The plain people are studying the question, and they are using their common sense in making their decisions in regard to it. One or two members of the legislature who voted against the bill to prohibit the teaching of evolution said in substance: "We do not pretend to be experts on the subject; but we know the teachers in the high schools and the universities who believe in evolution; we know their character and

intelligence; these teachers say that evolution does not crowd God out of his universe, and we are inclined towards their view; therefore we will not vote for the bill."

This was plainly a sensible view to take. Whom should we follow if not the men of intelligence who lead a godly life, and who have given a life-time to the careful study of these scientific questions?

Most of the newspapers of Kentucky were opposed to the bill. Even in small towns where conservatism and prejudice are most apt to abound the newspapers championed academic freedom. As reported by the *Literary Digest*, *The Rocky Mountain News* made mention of those persons " 'who are trying to turn back the clock in the domain of religious thought.' If children be taught that religious faith is necessarily tied to theories of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and the special creation by divine fiat of each of the many species of life on this planet, it will not be surprising if shipwreck be made of their faith when they begin to face the facts of history and science. . . . . Science has not shaken the fact of Christ.

Scholarship has only helped to make it stand out more clearly."

The religious press is on the side of evolution. The Methodist *Western Christian Advocate* says, "that Christian thinkers have taken over the theory of evolution, and adopted it as one of the greatest doctrines used today in support of the Christian theory."

This from *The Literary Digest:* "Educators and religious leaders all over the country were up in arms when the proposed Kentucky anti-evolution bill was noised abroad, and numerous telegrams were sent to President Frank L. McVey, of the University of Kentucky, in response to his request for opinions on the proposed measure. Such a measure, wrote Dr. Lyman Abbott, editor of *The Outlook,* would be fatal to the best interests of pupils in any school in which it could be enforced. Evolution is correctly defined by John Fisk as God's way of doing things. Practically all scientists hold it, and most colleges teach it in some form."

Dr. Angell, President of Yale University, said: "To prohibit the scientific teaching of facts of evolution would involve adopting the

intellectual attitude of the twelfth century. It is a proposition which could not be seriously entertained by any really intelligent person."

President Lowell, of Harvard University, said: "Prohibiting the teaching of evolution is antediluvian folly."

Dr. Charles S. MacFarland, General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America said: "Any attempt to impose legislative restrictions on the teachers of science is contrary to all the principles on which the American Republic has been founded."

Leading men in all professions, Governors of our states, are speaking out candidly and fearlessly in support of evolution and the rights of academic freedom. The utterances of Hon. A. A. Taylor, Governor of Tennessee, before a teachers' association in West Tennessee, as reported in the Memphis *Commercial Appeal* are wholesome and uplifting. He said in part:

"Whatever may be the opinion of the cynics to the contrary, I maintain that no argument is needed to establish the fact that by growth, progressive development and expansion during

many thousands of years, man has attained to a degree of moral, mental, if not physical superiority immeasurably above his prototype of the stone age, aye, and of many succeeding ages, even within historic times. If this were not true, then the whole scheme of man and nature would be a dismal failure and we should be existing to-day — if indeed we existed at all — as a rudimentary humanity in a rudimentary world. For it is evident from what we observe in nature, that the scheme of creation, animate and inanimate, is one of growth, progress, evolution, from the lower to the higher, from the inferior to the superior. The earth, the planets, the suns and all the solar systems, were evolved from nebulous masses of gaseous or vaporized matter incandescent with primordial fire. Such, I believe to be the plan and formula of creative omnipotence and in such manner sprung the world from chaos. The work days of the Almighty are the nightless cycles whose suns never set, and a thousand milleniums of labor to Him are as the tick of a watch or the swing of a pendulum. His labors consume the eternities, and He maketh the desert void of the

illimitable to blossom as the rose with the glories and wonders of his handiwork. Man was created out of the dust of the earth, but how many ages the process covered is a question which science can never fathom. The oak alone rises into being from the miracle of the dust — but the process extends through more than 500 years. In the Pacific slope states — notably California — there are giant trees to-day which in all probability were stalwart young saplings when our Savior was born, and perhaps full grown trees when William the Conqueror landed on the shores of England. We do not plant seeds today and gather the harvest tomorrow, but only after many laborious days of sunshine and shower. The act of creation includes not only the beginning, but the finishing also. In this sense the creation of man is not even yet complete — nor can it be until his soul shall have reached the full stature which his creator intended. It is a far cry from protoplasm to finished man."

If Mr. Bryan has said the worst that can be said against evolution, I am confident that evolution is safe from harm. I am willing for

college men and for plain men of common sense the world over to sit in judgment on this declaration. Mr. Bryan's principal points in this discussion are ridicule and denunciation. His supreme idea is to rule the question out of court by raising a laugh about "our ancestors that once had tails." His next strong point is to denounce as atheists and corrupters of the morals of our youth the teachers in the high schools and universities and the ministers in our best and strongest churches, who favor the doctrine. He may write a thousand books, and flood the country with such "arguments," but the people will not respond to such methods. The efforts to discredit the doctrine of evolution by misrepresenting Darwin's attitude toward God will not save the day for the anti-evolutionists. I use the word "misrepresenting" deliberately. Mr. Darwin's attitude has been misrepresented. Reading the *Life and Letters of Darwin* written by his son, you will find the following facts: Never did Darwin say "I do not believe in the existence of God." All his positive statements were thoroughly theistic. Can you imagine statements in support of the

existence of God plainer and stronger than these: "It is impossible to conceive that this grand and wondrous Universe, with our conscious selves, is the work of chance." "In my extreme fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of God." *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin,* by his son, page 279, 1879.

Can language be plainer than that? If Darwin had said ten millions of times in different words that he believed in the existence of God could it have been plainer?

But Darwin had doubts, and in one thing he was agnostic. The Duke of Argyle reported Darwin as saying: "The idea of purpose, mind behind natural phenomena often comes over me with overwhelming force. But at other times it seems to go away." (Quoted from memory.) The thing that worried Darwin was the great amount of terrific suffering in the world. At times he could not see how there could be such suffering, and, at the same time a good God. But, mind you, he never allowed his doubts to destroy his belief in God. He said: "In my *extreme fluctuations* (doubts) I

have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of God." (Italics mine.)

Furthermore, *who* has *no* doubts? Is it not hard, sometimes, and impossible, sometimes, for the most avowed believer in God to reconcile his existence with the suffering and injustice in the world? Do we not often hear some of our most devout ministers say that maybe we will understand these things better by and by? That we must believe where we can not know? The great fact is that every educated man, and every plain man who dares to think for himself is, to some extent, an agnostic. There are some things in regard to which the only thing he can say is, I do not know. For instance: Who can account for existence? The existence of anything. How did matter originate? How did Spirit originate? How did God come into existence?

Most people are satisfied with the assumption that matter and Spirit have always existed; but that throws no ray of light on the question of origin. "Canst thou by searching find out God, canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" Job 11:7. Job could not. Can any-

one? Can you? Is it strange that people, any people, Darwin and others, should have doubts? That there are some things they do not understand?

But Darwin's doubts do not vitiate the doctrine of evolution. The facts of evolution are independent of any man's explanation of Primary Cause. Science discusses secondary causes. Science tells us what the secondary causes are, and it has taught us many undeniable facts. The great question of Primary Cause is a question of philosophy and theology.

I have shown that the overwhelming number of competent scientists are theistic. Nothing is more beautiful than this from Herbert Spencer: "But one truth must ever grow clearer — the truth that there is an inscrutable Existence everywhere manifested, to which we can neither find nor conceive either beginning or end. Amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain this absolute certainty, that we are ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed."

As the work of this Eternal Energy has re-

sulted in an intelligible Universe and an intelligent man how can we withhold belief that this Eternal Energy is intelligent?

Students are impressed with these strong and beautiful words of Spencer and also of other great evolutionists and it helps to account for the fact that most all of the students in our high schools and universities believe the doctrine of evolution. These alert young people are not going to hark back to the cosmogony of the Old Testament. This cosmogony has been reverently laid aside by the scholarship of the world. The student body as a whole is wholesome and reverent. No doubt there are a few that are flippant and shallow; but the fact remains that our high schools and universities are sending out a constant stream of young men and women who are truly religious, and whose lives are swayed by the great sanctities of life.

Professor Carl Murcheson, of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, deplores the fact that there are quite a number of college men who have been sent to prison for small offenses; but he adds: "The evidence is very strong that college training is a strong preventive of crimes of

violence. For all practical purposes crimes of violence on the part of college men can be ignored. Remember that two per cent of the criminals are college men, but those college men commit only one half of one per cent of the crimes of violence."

A recent report from the University of Chicago shows that, out of 2,000 students there was only one avowed atheist, and two agnostics. 88 per cent of the students held membership in the churches, and 89 per cent attended university chapel.

No doubt a similar showing could be made for the other universities of our country.

A minister in one of our large cities of the South said recently from the pulpit: "If the public schools and state universities do not teach religion they should on the other hand not ridicule it. If they fail to increase the faith of the students they have no right to undermine that faith. Yet, that is what they are doing. Seventy-five per cent of the college graduates never go back to the Sunday Schools after graduation. Almost as many give up

their church going, their Bible reading, and their prayers."

The above statement is an inexcusable exaggeration. It is not in keeping with the facts that I have stated in regard to the University of Chicago and other similar facts that could be cited from other universities. Such exaggeration does no credit to religion, or the church, or the minister who makes it. The following is a very significant statement taken from the *Christian Register,* Boston, of July 6th, 1922, page 641:

The Continent, a Presbyterian paper, has been conducting an investigation among the colleges of the country with reference to the allegation of Mr. Bryan that students have traveled far from the faith of their fathers, and that such deflection has been due to misguided scientific teaching. The consensus of opinion from the nearly one hundred colleges interviewed was that students usually pass through an intellectual unrest. Some of the college presidents declared that this was the object of college training. A few students may leave the church. More, however, are won than are lost.

Most of the institutions appear to be continuing the teaching of the evolutionary theory despite the opposition of Mr. Bryan and the fundamentalists. If the colleges give biblical courses, they employ text-books written by men who are classed as higher critics."

Let us examine the accusation that "Seventy-five per cent of college graduates do not go back to Sunday School." It is a fact that some college graduates do not return to Sunday School, and there is nothing surprising in that. Students graduate from the universities from between the ages of 25 and 35. Is it not a fact that a great many people quit the Sunday School between the ages of 25 and 35 whether they are college graduates or business men or clerks or stenographers or what not? Look around you in any community. Are not most of the people between the above ages who are not in the Sunday School men and women who never attended a university? University training has very little or nothing to do with it.

But I can very readily understand why some high school graduates and college students do not return to some Sunday Schools. When a

young man goes to school, and finds out from his study of geology that the earth is some millions of years old instead of about six thousand according to what some people insist is Bible chronology; when he learns from history, and botany, and biology that the Bible is not a handbook of science there is no wonder that he does not return to the Sunday School which continues to teach these discarded dogmas. It is a compliment to the young men and women that they refuse to stultify their intelligence.

Let me mention a case that actually occurred: In one of the high schools in one of our cities a young girl about sixteen was taught by her teacher of geology that the earth was many millions of years old, and that man and all other creatures were much older than commonly supposed; that the flood was local, and that there were other discrepancies between the Bible accounts and science. She went to her mother with these facts, and told her that her Sunday School teacher had taught her otherwise, and asked what she must do. Her mother told her that her high school teacher was right. It resulted in the girl's leaving the Sunday School,

and joining another church whose Sunday School teaching was in keeping with modern science.

The college professor is not necessarily irreverent, and he is within his rights, when he declares in the class room that when the statements of the Bible conflict with the well-established facts of science the student should follow science. The time is coming when the Sunday Schools that do not take this position will be depleted, and justly so.

Dr. Henry C. Vedder, President of Crozer Theological Seminary, a very spiritual leader, a devoted member of the Baptist church, has this to say in his pamphlet on a "Safe and Sane Bible."

"I once heard a man who had been many years a teacher in one of the Bible schools, boast that he still believed everything that he had learned about it at his mother's knee. A man of his intelligence should have known that this was something to blush for, not to boast about. Our dear mother's walking by the light they had, taught us some things about the Bible that were not truth. That is no reason for honor-

ing them less, for they did their best by us; but we shall dishonor ourselves if, with the additional light that a generation's study has thrown on the Bible, we do not better their knowledge.

"A speaker can easily win applause from an unthinking audience by shouting, 'I believe the Bible from cover to cover, every word, every syllable;' but no educated man can honestly say that today. No half-educated man can honestly say that. To say that honestly, a man must have escaped education altogether. Advocates of verbal inspiration and literal interpretation, if they could succeed in persuading the world to accept the Bible at their valuation, would make it impossible for any educated person to believe such a Bible. They would make such a complete divorce between religion and intelligence as would drive all the intelligence from the churches. The real friends and defenders of the Bible are not those who strive to compel men to accept it at their false valuation, but those who ask to receive the Bible at its own valuation. Are we willing to receive the Bible for what the Bible itself claims to be?"

My firm belief is we can trust the plain people, and this is a hopeful fact in connection with the higher education of our youth. Here is an instance that shows the trust-worthiness of the men and women who are controlling our educational institutions: In one of our large cities charges were brought against the teacher of one of the high schools that he was attempting to "thrust the famous doctrine of evolution down the throats of the third grade pupils." The question was discussed in a board meeting, and the Professor was completely exonerated, and was re-elected.

The facts show that the doctrine of evolution with its larger vision of God and creation is growing in favor with all thoughtful people. Let every one who believes the doctrine stand up for what he thinks is right. It is our duty to proclaim the truth as we see it, and moral cowardice ought not to hinder us. Because the doctrine of evolution is very unpopular in some localities should not prevent the student of science from taking a firm stand in support of it. In nearly every generation of the past, men have had to give up everything that was dear

to them for the sake of truth as they saw it. Let us be just as willing to do the same in our generation.

The study of evolution has made three very deep and abiding impressions on me:

1. God's tireless patience.
2. The sacredness of law.
3. The certainty of spiritual help.

God's tireless patience in working out the great problems of the Universe is a never failing source of wonder and reverence. Hundreds of thousands, nay, millions of years, he has been patiently working to bring His physical Universe with all its plant and animal forms to perfection. And He has been working ceaselessly to bring man in his moral, religious, and spiritual ideals and daily living onward and upward toward perfection. God is working still. Astronomers tell us that God is still creating new worlds. God is still working in the soul of man endeavoring with man's co-operation to create higher and more enduring ideas and ideals. Some day war will cease. Some day there will be peace and plenty for all souls. The Great Being through whose tireless labors

so many things have been brought to perfection will not leave man in his present state of greed, selfishness and sin. The God of Isaiah is our God today, and He is saying to us what He said to him: "Fear thou not for I am with thee: Be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness."

The sacredness of law. How can I violate law, the law of the land, the laws of my physical, moral, spiritual being? These laws are the expression of ages of struggle upward, and were nourished at every step by the Immanent God. They are the expression of the longing, the aspirations, the heart-aches of the people.

> "Slowly the Bible of the race is writ;
> And not on paper leaves nor leaves of stone;
> Each age, each kindred adds a verse to it,
> Texts of despair, or hope, of joy or moan."

How can I violate the law that helps me to be something more than an animal? How can I violate law, and fall below the beast of the field?

The greatest impression of all is the certainty of God's help in man's moral and spiritual life. If this whole tremendous scheme of material and physical progress from "a mist on the far horizon" to suns and stars and planets and man, from a one-cell plant life to all we see today that is beautiful and good is the outcome of a pervasive Spirit, the ever-living God, how much more certain it is that this same Great Spirit to whom man is most akin will help man to rise to higher and still higher realms of the spiritual. Man's physical needs are important. They can not be neglected. Nature, the Immanent God is helping to feed man through the unfailing laws of the seasons, heat and cold, seedtime and harvest. But how much more necessary it is that man's soul, the divine, the immortal part of him, should be strengthened, should be built up into all the power and beauty of a true man. It is impossible to suppose that God, in nature, should be so very careful of man's physical needs, and indifferent to the needs of his soul.

Revelation, the presence and power of the ever-living God in the soul of man, is a

complement of organic evolution, and on scientific grounds I believe the doctrine.

The evolutionist is a man of religion. This is God's world. We marvel at His tireless patience and persistence. They fill us with hope for the future of the human race. He who worked millions of years to perfect the earth and make it habitable, and who filled it with good things and beautiful for man's mind and body will never cease his efforts to make here and now a stronger, better, human being. The answer to our cry for help in this sin-cursed world against greed, injustice, passion, and selfishness is to be found in the best and sanest work we can do to help ourselves, and in our steadfast trust in the Immanent God of evolution and the Transcendant God of religion.

THE END

Bibliography

WORKS on evolution and religion are very numerous. One will find a most abundant literature on the subject in almost any public library. I have found the following works very instructive and very interesting: *The Bible;* Dr. Sunderland, *Origin and Character of the Bible;* Darwin, *Descent of Man,* and *Origin of Species; Life and Letters of Darwin,* by his son; LeConte, *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought;* John C. Kimball, *Ethical Aspects of Evolution;* Dr. Woods Hutchinson, *The Gospel According to Darwin;* Oscar Schmidt, *Descent and Darwinism;* John Fisk, *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy* (2 vols.); Huxley, *Lay Sermons and Reviews;* Henry Drummond, *The Ascent of Man* and *Natural Law in the Spiritual World;* Dr. Lyman Abbott, *The Evolution of Christianity;* Briggs, *The Bible, the Church, and the Reason;* Cyclopedia Biblica (5 vols.) article, *Creation;* Cyclopedia Britannica, articles *Botany, Biology,* and *Evolution;* Prof. Needham, *General Biology;* Dr. J. W. Buckham, *Religion as Experience;* Dr. Andrew D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology,* (2 vols.); Dr. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* A study from the standpoint of the Higher Criticism.

DATE DUE

SEP 24 1993

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0013519 9

213.5
R662

Robinson, John Lunsford

AUTHOR

Evolution and religion.

TITLE

213.5
R662 Robinson, John Lunsford
Evolution and religion.

N15044